DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 533 EC 100 261

AUTHOR Thomas, George; And Others
TITLE Supply and Demand for Child Foster Family Care in the Southeast.
INSTITUTION Regional Inst. of Social Welfare Research, Athens, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 77
GRANT SRS-09-P-56015/4-07
NOTE 210p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Welfare; Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Foster Children; *Foster Family; *Human Services; *Needs Assessment; Research

ABSTRACT

Described is a study of foster care services for 31,911 children in eight southeastern states. It is explained that questionnaires were completed by state and county foster care officials and by foster families. Results are reported to indicate that the foster child sample was largely white preteens, evenly divided between the sexes. The effects of funding, recruitment, licensing, and the role of the foster parent on the current supply of foster homes are discussed. Cited are potential sources of demand outside the current foster care programs such as the low income family, abused and neglected children, institutionalized children with special needs, and delinquent children. Estimates of the unmet need for foster care are given. Proposed is a phased effort to close the gap between supply and demand. Among recommended actions are providing a clearer role definition of the foster parent, heightened recruitment efforts, development of licensing standards, and establishment of training programs for foster parents and foster care workers. Appended are study questionnaires. (CL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136533

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SUPPLY AND DEMAND for CHILD FOSTER FAMILY CARE in THE SOUTHEAST

George Thomas, Ph.D.
and
Leonard Poilane, Ed.D.
Robert Bransford, MSW
Shrikant Parchure, MA

EC 100261

Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research, Inc.
468 N. Milledge Ave., Athens, Ga. 30603 (404)542-7614

Acknowledgements

This study was carried out over an 18 month period beginning July 1, 1975, with grant support from the Social and Rehabilitation Service, DHEW, No. SRS 09-P-56015/4-07, by the Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research, University of Georgia.

Dr. George Thomas was the project director until July 1, 1976, when the Institute disaffiliated from the University. At that time project direction was transferred to Dr. Leonard Pollane, School of Social Work, at the University of Georgia.

Special thanks go to Dr. Pollane for the continuity he lent to the project, to Robert Bransford for his deft handling of the difficult role of project coordinator and to Shrikant Parchure for his diligence in coding and preparing the data.

A note of appreciation is also expressed to James Vaughn, Region IV Community Services PSA, SRS, for his abiding interest in and skill in planning and conducting project activities throughout its life.

Recognition is also due Dr. Tony LaCavera for his able efforts in programming and processing the data jointly with Dr. Pollane, and to Institute secretaries, Christine Bennett and Vara Hunter, for typing the report.

Finally, this study owes most to the outstanding cooperation of foster family care officials in the 8 states in Region IV, directors and other staff in 64 counties, and 1155 foster parents who followed often difficult procedures in providing the data for this report.

The author is solely responsible for errors and omissions, and statements of opinion are his alone and do not necessarily reflect those of the study's sponsor.

January, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements iii
List of Tables vi

CHAPTER I: OVERVIEW AND THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY 1

Supply and Demand for Foster Family Care 1
Specific Purposes of the Study 5

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY 7

The State Sample: Methods and Procedures 7
The County Sample: Methods and Procedures 8
The Foster Parent and Child Sample: Methods and Procedures 10
Characteristics and Adequacy of the Actual Sample 11
Numerical Coverage 11
Demographic Characteristics 14
Summary of Foster Parent Sample Characteristics 17
Race and Parental Status 17
Own Children 17
Age 20
Number of Years Licensed and Type of License 20
Income 20
Education 20
Foster Parent Association Affiliations 21
Summary of Foster Child Sample Characteristics 21

CHAPTER III: THE CURRENT SUPPLY OF FOSTER FAMILY HOMES .. 25

Foster Family Care Funding 25
Notes on Rate Setting 25
What Do these Rates Pay for? 28
Foster Family Home Recruitment Efforts 28
The Net Effect of Recruitment on Foster Family Home Supply 32
Foster Family Home Licensing Procedures 37
Reasons for License Rejections, Revocations, and Voluntary Withdrawals 41
A Note on Contracting with Foster Parents 42
Licensing Foster Family Homes for Children with Special Needs 44
The Current Role of the Foster Parent 45
Agency Supports 45
Services: Who Provides/Who Pays 49
Supportive Services 50
Services for Foster Child Behavior Problems 53
Foster Parent Training 55
Summary 57

CHAPTER IV: SOURCES OF DEMAND FOR FOSTER FAMILY CARE 61

Potential Sources of Demand Outside Current Foster Family Care Programs 63
The Low Income Family 63
Abused and Neglected Children 66
Institutionalized Children with Special Needs 71
Delinquent Children 71
Mentally and Physically Handicapped Children ... 73
Potential Sources of Demand Within Current Foster Family Care Programs 75
Children Recommended for Foster Family Placement Who Were Not Placed 75
Children in Foster Family Care Who Need Something Else 78
Termination of Parental Rights Proceedings 80
Summary 84

CHAPTER V: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN SUPPLY AND DEMAND ... 89

Major Factors Contributing to the Gap Between Supply and Demand 90
1. A Lack of Mechanisms for State Leadership 90
2. Absence of a Clear Priority on Providing Foster Family Care for Children with Special Needs 92
3. Confusion Regarding the Foster Parent Role .. 93
What State and Local Officials Think Needs to be Done to Bridge the Gap 94
Factors Influencing Quantity and Quality 95
Factors Influencing Program Adaptability to Changing Demand 97
Program Options: Issues Pertinent to Modification and Expansion 97
The Modification of Current Programs 97
Program Expansion 106
Summary: A Phased Effort to Close the Gap Between Supply and Demand 108
Phase I: Improvements in Current Programs 108
Phase II: Modification of Current Programs 110
Non-obvious Costs in Program Modification 113
Phase III: Program Expansion 114

APPENDIX A: County Foster Family Care Program Questionnaire .....

APPENDIX B: Southeastern Foster Parent Survey Questionnaire .....

APPENDIX C: Foster Child Information Sheet .....

LIST OF TABLES

2.1 The 64 County Foster Parent Sample: Total Number and Questionnaire Return Rates, by States and Region 13

2.2 The 64 County Foster Child Sample: Total Numbers and Questionnaire Return Rates, by States and Region 15

2.3 The 64 County Foster Family and Foster Child Sample: Total Number and Return Rates, by County Population Size 16

2.4 The 64 County Foster Family Sample: Percent Distributions for Total Population and Obtained Sample for Race and Parental Status, by County Population Size 18

2.5 The 64 County Foster Child Sample: Percent Distributions for Total Population and Obtained Sample for Race, Sex, and Age, by County Population Size 19

2.6 The Foster Child Sample: Sex and Race Distributions, by County Population Size 22

2.7 The Foster Child Sample: Age Distribution, by County Population Size 23

2.8 The Foster Child Sample: School Grade Distribution, by County Population Size 23

2.9 The Foster Child Sample: Length of Stay, by County Population Size 24

3.1 Regular and Special Foster Family Care Board Rate and Service Fee Programs and Payment Levels, by States, FY '76 26

3.2 Methods of Payment by Number of States and Cost Items 29

3.3 Selected Medical Service Payment Provisions, by States, FY '76 31

3.4 State and County Foster Family Recruitment Appeals by Type and Geographic Coverage, for FY '76 33

3.5 Total Number of State and County Recruitment Appeals Specific to Serving Children with Special Needs, by Type of Child 34

3.6 Net Change in the Number of Licensed Foster Family Homes by States, FY '76 34

3.7 Net Change in the Number of Licensed Foster Family Homes in 64 Counties, by County Population Size, FY '76 35

3.8 License Application Approval, Rejection, and Withdrawal Rates in 64 Counties, by County Population Size, FY '76 36

3.9 Foster Family Home Licensing and Review Process, by States, FY '76 38

3.10 State Licensing Responsibility for Independently Operated Foster Family Home Programs, FY '76 40

3.11 Conditions Under which States Provide Licenses/ Approvals to Foster Family Homes that Do Not Meet State Minimum Standards 41

3.12 Reasons for Application Rejection/License Revocation in Declining Order of Frequency of Use by County Agencies 43

3.13 Reasons for Voluntary Withdrawals in Declining Order of Frequency of Use by Applicants and Licensed Foster Family Homes 43

3.14 Percentages of Foster Families Saying They Have Not Received Adequate Information about Foster Children in Their Care, by Types of Information and County Population Size 48

3.15 Types of Training Most Desired by Foster Parents ... 49

3.16 Percentage of Foster Children for Whom Foster Parents Regularly Provide and Pay for 15 Types of Supportive Services, by County Population Size 51

3.17 Percentage Distribution of Foster Parents' Provision and Payment of Foster Child Supportive Services, by County Population Size 52

3.18 Foster Parent Percentage Estimates of Total Foster Child Care Direct Costs Covered by All Agency Payments 53

3.19	Percentage of All Instances of 23 Foster Child Behavior Problems that Foster Parents Attempted to Resolve Themselves	54
3.20	Types of Foster Parent Training Services, by Level of Government Sponsoring/Conducting	56
4.1	Child Abuse and Neglect Estimates for Region IV, by States	69
4.2	Projected Regionwide Distribution of Reasons for Not Placing Children in Need of Foster Family Care .	76
4.3	The 64 County Sample Distribution of Non Placements, by County Population Size, FY '76	76
4.4	The 64 County Sample Distribution of Out-of-County Placement Rates and Maximum Licensed Capacity Levels, by County Population Size, FY '76	77
4.5	The 64 County Sample Distribution of Estimates of Foster Children Needing Some Other Type of Care, by County Population Size, FY '76	79
4.6	The 64 County Sample Distribution of Other Types of Placement Needs for Current Foster Children, and Regionwide Projections	79
4.7	Percentages of Foster Children Demonstrating Serious Behavioral Problems Per Foster Parent Reports, by County Population Size and Regionwide Projections	81
4.8	Number of Termination of Parental Rights Petitions Completed on Behalf of Foster Children, FY '73-'76, by County Population Size	82
4.9	Summary of Estimated Unmet Need for Child Foster Family Care Services in Region IV	85
5.1	Rank Order Presentation of Factors Having Greatest Impact on Program Quantity, Quality and Adaptability, According to State and Local Foster Family Care Officials	96
5.2	Willingness of Current Foster Parents to Accept Children with 10 Different Special Needs	99
5.3	Distribution of Current Foster Parents Willing to Accept 4 Types of Children with Special Needs Now, or Under Improved Conditions	100

5.4 Types of Training Required by Foster Parents as a Condition to Accepting Children with Special Needs, by Rank, Percent Requiring, and Type of Child 102

5.5 Types of Supportive Services Required by Foster Parents as a Condition to Accepting Children with Special Needs, by Rank, Percent Requiring, and Type of Child 103

5.6 Regionwide Projections of the Modifiability of the Current Foster Family Home Supply Under Optimum Conditions and a 50 Percent Conversion Rate, by Type of Specialized Home 105

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Nearly all publicly sponsored social services for children share the same fate: unexpectedly and often for unclear reasons they become subject to controversy, reappraisal and change.

As a group, children neither have a voice in nor the capacity to defend against the rise and fall of political priorities, special interest group causes, professional fads, and news media coverage that influence their programs, periodically bouncing them back and forth between obscurity and intense public scrutiny.

At the moment we are experiencing a rise in public interest in foster family care that calls for a fresh look at the role these programs play in meeting the out-of-home placement needs of children.

Supply and Demand for Foster Family Care

No one can say for sure how many children are in foster family placements in the United States, but the frequently heard estimate is 300,000.[1]

Some sources suggest that demand far exceeds supply and that vigorous efforts need to be undertaken immediately to expand current programs.

This viewpoint is frequently expressed by advocates of *deinstitutionalization* who consider various forms of foster family care as the preferred placements for hundreds of thousands of children now in institutions.[2]

---

[1]Robert H. Mnookin, "Foster Care--In Whose Best Interests," Harvard Educational Review, 43(4), 1973, p. 610.

[2]George Thomas, Is Statewide Deinstitutionalization a Forward or Backward Social Movement? (Athens, Georgia: Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research, Research Monograph Series, 1976).

An alternative line of reasoning, now gaining momentum sees more harm than good resulting from deinstitutionalization programs.[3]

Implicitly, this challenge raises questions about the magnitude of demand and the role of foster family care relative to deinstitutionalization.

Other potential sources of rising demand are the rapidly increasing numbers of abused and neglected children coming to public attention and a perhaps growing number of children needing out-of-home placements as a result of rising trends in teenage pregnancy and marital breakdown, particularly in such families also faced with severe economic hardship.

To date, much more emphasis has been placed on evaluating supply than upon estimating demand.

Indeed, the two factors are rarely considered in studies of supply and this at least partly explains why most such works concern themselves with the quality of foster home care rather than with the numerical capacity of foster home aggregates.

One frequently heard warning that bears on potential supplies of foster family homes is that the rapid movement of women into the world of employment may portend shortages in the future.[4]

Beyond this observation, the literature is largely reflective of a number of criticisms of the quality of care in the current supply of foster family homes.

---

[3]Henry Santiestevan, Deinstitutionalization: Out of Their Beds and Into the Streets (Washington, D.C.: American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, December, 1976), pp. 22ff; and, Amitai Etzioni, "'Deinstitutionalization', A Public Policy Fashion," Evaluation, (3), 1-2, 1976, pp. 9ff.

[4]Alfred Kadushin, "Institutions for Dependent and Neglected Children," in, D.M. Pappenport, Dee M. Kilpatrick, and W.R. Roberts (eds) Child Caring: Social Policy and the Institution (Chicago: Aldine, 1973), pp. 145-176.

Most of this criticism stems from an observed gap between what is being done for children and what the observers believe to be the real purpose and role of foster family care.

A major criticism of this sort focuses on the failure of foster family care programs to perform what is believed to be its true function in providing temporary care in the process of rehabilitating natural homes and reuniting children and their parents.

From this perspective programs have failed because many children have been found to be in long-term care that eventually becomes *de facto* permanent care.[5]

Others raise serious questions about the harm to children in foster family care arising from being left in legal limbo.[6]

Stressing the temporary nature of care and the overriding program goal of reuniting families has also surfaced important questions about the value of encouraging the development of emotional bonds between foster parents and children in care.[7]

Along this line, the New York Board of Social Welfare ruled in 1976 to prohibit the use of corporal punishment by

---

[5]Henry S. Maas, "Children in Long-Term Foster Care," Child Welfare, 48(6), 1969; R. Dinnage and M.L.K. Pringle, Foster Home Care Facts and Fallacies (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1967); and data cited in this study, Table 2-9.

[6]Hasseltine B. Taylor, "Guardianship or 'Permanent Placement for Children,'" in J. Ten Broek (ed) The Law of the Poor (San Francisco: Chandler, 1966), pp. 417-423.

[7]Barbara Campbell, "Foster Homes: A Matter of Living, But Not Too Much," New York Times, October 26, 1975; Joseph Meisels and Martin Loeb, "Unanswered Questions about Foster Care," Social Science Review, 30(3), 1956; and, "Foster Care: New Trends and Developments in a Changing Field," Virginia Child Protection Newsletter, 3(3), 1976, pp. 1ff.

foster parents, thereby implicitly passing judgment on the quality of care and materially altering the foster parent role towards that of caretaker and away from substitute parenting.[8]

While foster family care can be attacked for its failure to perform a temporary service in behalf of the goal of reuniting families, it can also be argued that foster family homes offer unique features including home-like environment, individual attention, and emotional warmth not generally found in other types of out-of-home placements.

Additionally, there is growing recognition in some quarters that permanent foster family care may be the preferred placement mode for some children who can never return home and for whom termination of parental rights is not possible.

These are not diametrically opposed viewpoints. Rather, the merits of each must be brought together to develop a refined and more differentiated assessment of the purpose and quality of our overall foster family home supply.

A similar observation can be applied to a second major criticism, namely, that the current supply of foster family homes is defective because it fails to serve children needing out-of-home placements who have special problems or handicaps.[9]

Advocates of deinstitutionalization are highly sympathetic to this criticism, yet the real question for these advocates and concerned others is, "What kinds of foster family care for what kinds of children; and, for how many, how long?"

To answer this question we must move beyond the either/or level of debate and bring the issues of supply and demand together for joint study.

---

[8]"Board of Social Welfare Bans Corporal Punishment in Foster Homes," Family Life Development, Newsletter of the Family Life Development Center, Cornell University, 1(6), 1976, pp. 1ff.

[9]Constance Osgood, et al., State of the Art: Foster Family Care (Kansas City: Institute for Community Studies, December, 1974), Mimeo, 29 pp.

This study makes a beginning effort in this direction in the hope that it will assist in identifying the merits in these various viewpoints, lead to a better understanding of the foster family home supply by placing it within the context of estimated demand, and point the way to a reasonable course of action.

The major contribution may be in moving program decision makers beyond present circumstances in which demand is in fact determined by supply.

Simply put, the numbers and types of children served are those for whom placements exist.

This approach must be turned around, so that supply will be shaped to meet unmet need.

Foster family care is back in the limelight at least partly because we have not taken this step.

Specific Purposes of the Study

This study was guided by one important assumption, namely, that foster family care services are an essential component of current publicly sponsored child welfare programs, and are likely to continue to be so.

From the outset, then, our overriding concern was to learn something that might be useful in improving foster family care services, rather than to identify reasons for and to point out ways and means to achieve their elimination or replacement.

Our focus was publicly sponsored foster family care programs in the 8 southeastern states within Region IV of DHEW, namely, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The aims of the study were as follow:

1. *To Assess the Supply of Foster Family Homes for Children* (including types, numbers, and characteristics);

2. *To Estimate the Extent of Unmet Need--or Potential Sources of Demand both Within and Outside Current Foster Family Care Programs* (including estimates

of undetected need, detected but unmet need, and inappropriate placements);

3. *To Assess Current Program Policies, Operational Procedures, Management Styles and Provisions to Identify Major Factors Influencing the Gap between Supply and Demand;*

4. *To Formulate a Reasoned Course of Action to Close the Gap between Supply and Demand Based on the Overall Results of the Study.*

Our account of how well we met these aims is covered in the remainder of this report.

Chapter II describes how we carried out the study; Chapter III gives our assessment of the current supply of foster family homes in the Southeast; Chapter IV provides our estimates of the size and nature of unmet need--or potential demand; and, Chapter IV summarizes our findings and offers what we think to be a reasoned course of action for bridging the gap between supply and demand.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the field phase of the study was to obtain a comprehensive picture of present foster family care programs in the Southeast, including their scope, methods of operations, limitations and problems, and their potential for adapting to changing service needs and demands.

Several procedural problems presented themselves since the decision had been reached earlier to tap data sources at all levels including states, counties, foster family parents and foster family children.

The domain of study was immense: 8 states, 734 counties, 16,232 licensed foster family homes, and 31,911 children in foster family care.

Time and financial constraints and common sense dictated sampling approaches in the data collection process.

In general, it was decided to obtain comprehensive data from each state, to obtain similar data from a stratified sample of county programs from within each state, and to obtain data about every foster family home and the children they serve within each selected county.

The State Sample: Methods & Procedure

The first step in this study was the construction of a comprehensive data collection questionnaire for state programs by Institute staff.

This questionnaire was submitted to foster family care officials from the 8 states in Region IV for review and revisions at a meeting sponsored by Region IV SRS in Atlanta during September, 1975.

A final draft of the questionnaire was submitted to each state for completion in October, 1975, with the instruction to respond to each question with data readily available through machine or manual manipulation at the state level.

In most cases, state officials were also asked to identify the source of data (form, report, etc.) and data utilized to complete the questions.

The purpose of these instructions was to obtain an impression from the states of the nature, type and sources of data available to them in the conduct of their jobs.

It was our assumption that data not readily available to complete questionnaire items was also not readily available to state officials in carrying out day to day decision making tasks.

This impression, in turn, would be helpful in assessing the effects of data and reporting systems on planning and developing the foster family care program.

Additionally, a comparison of this sort between state and county generated data in the study would afford an observation on what kinds of data might be readily available at the county level but either not reported to or collected by the state.

Following submittal of the questionnaires to all states, Institute staff visited each state once to provide technical assistance on any matter concerning state staff having to do with item interpretations.

Questionnaires from all 8 states were completed and returned to the Institute for analysis by March 1, 1976.

The County Sample: Methods and Procedure

One purpose of the study was to identify variations in the conduct and provision of foster family services between heavily populated and rural areas in the Southeast. A case could also be made that services might vary meaningfully between metropolitan areas and mid-sized communities.

This reasoning led to the selection of a stratified sample of counties based upon population size, with over representation of rural counties to ensure an adequate data base.

In order to maximize regional coverage, it was also decided to select the same number of counties from each of the 8 states.

An overall sample of 64 counties, 8 from each state, was decided upon, stratified as follows:

1 metropolitan county (over 250,000 in size)
2 urban counties (50,000 to 100,000 in size)
5 rural counties (under 50,000 with no single city exceeding 25,000)

Additionally, to ensure a geographic spread within states, the process prohibited selection of contiguous counties.

This set of criteria was submitted to state foster family care officials who then selected the counties within their states.

While this approach is more subject to bias in judgments than a stratified randomized selection performed by the Institute, in practicality it helped ensure county cooperation in this phase of data collection.

Once the counties were identified, a jointly sponsored (state-Institute) letter was sent soliciting their participation which yielded 100 percent agreement.

Upon receipt of each county's agreement to participate, a jointly sponsored cover letter accompained by a comprehensive questionnaire on county foster family care programs was mailed.

This questionnaire was in form a slightly modified revision of the one submitted to state officials for completion (Appendix A).[10] Six (6) questions solely germane to state operations were deleted, and the term "state" was replaced by "county" in many others.

The participating counties were also notified of the date and time of a one day meeting of county directors--or their delegates--to be held in their state under the joint sponsorship of their own state officials and Institute staff.

---

[10]Since the state and county questionnaire were virtually identical, only the county questionnaire is included in Appendix A to reduce unnecessary bulk. The state questionnaire is available upon request at the Institute.

This approach was repeated in each of the 8 states and helped assure a 100 percent return rate for county questionnaires (by September 1, 1976) and uniform exposure to the county role in data collection procedures.

The Foster Family Parent and Child Sample: Methods and Procedures

While work was proceeding with the states and counties, a questionnaire was drafted to obtain information on foster families and their foster children (Appendix B).

The initial draft was pretested with 3 separate local foster parent associations totalling 106 persons, and revised to remove ambiguities, jargon, and other dense passages from questionnaire items.

Each questionnaire contained, in addition to the main body of items on the foster family, individual "blue sheets" to be completed by foster parents for each child currently in care (Appendix C).

The revised questionnaires and cover letters to foster parents were distributed to the counties during each state's meeting in numbers sufficient to cover every foster parent and foster child in the 64 participating counties.

Each county was instructed to distribute its questionnaires through its individual case workers so that each receiving foster parent could relate questions or problems about the questionnaire to his or her case worker.

To maintain a double blind confidentiality of responses, each questionnaire was numbered with the Institute holding the master number file. Only the county knew the names of foster parent respondents.

In turn, a stamped self addressed envelop to the Institute accompanied each questionnaire so that no individual results were available to a respondent's county department.

A follow-up procedure was adopted that was designed to notify counties of questionnaire numbers not returned to the Institute 6 weeks after initial distribution.

Each county would then proceed to contact foster parents having the identified numbers to encourage them to return their questionnaires.

Unfortunately, time and cost constraints prohibited implementation of this procedure.

Instead, a cutoff date was implemented that resulted in accepting only those questionnaires returned to the Institute within 6 weeks of the distribution date.

Questionnaires received after this deadline were not included in the data coding process or the sample ultimately analyzed.

The goal of this phase in the data collection process was to obtain information on every foster family and foster child in the 64 participating counties.

In all, we achieved a 50.5 percent usable return rate for foster families (deleting incomplete and late received questionnaires), by the final deadline of November 1, 1976.

No doubt our inability to complete follow-up procedures materially effected the rate of return.

The next section presents data on the characteristics of the sample and examines its adequacy from a technical standpoint.

Characteristics and Adequacy of the Actual Sample

Numerical Coverage

As previously noted, data were collected on foster family care programs at the state level in all 8 states and in 64 counties (8 in each state) selected for geographic spread and population variation.

One site visit was held with each state and one group meeting with the cluster of counties within each state to assist in resolving ambiguities and problems in responding to data requests.

Both state and county respondents were instructed to provide data on their programs that was readily available to them through machine processing or minimal manual calculations.

This instruction afforded more assurance that we were getting the type and quality of data available on a day to day basis for program planning and conduct at both levels of government.

While we can say with some assurance that we learned what state officials know about their programs in all states, a question remains about the representativeness of the county sample; namely, did our procedures yield a sufficiently representative picture of county programs to support region-wide generalizations about county programs.

This question is best answered by assessing the representativeness of the foster family and foster child sample obtained from these 64 counties. In short, if our foster family and foster child sample appears to be representative of the total foster family and foster child population regionwide, and representative of the aggregate population within the 64 counties, we can be reasonably assured that our county selection process produced no pronounced biases that would distort the data or yield false bases for generalizations.

Data in Table 2-1 indicate that our counties contained 14 percent of all licensed foster family homes in Region IV during the time of our study, and that we obtained data on a 7.1 percent of the entire population.

Data are also provided on the degree of coverage (return rate) we achieved across the cluster of counties in each state.

Our county clusters contained 14.0 of all licensed foster family homes within the region, with individual clusters ranging from 9.6 to 18.0 percent of their state totals.

Questionnaires were sent to every licensed foster family home in the 64 counties. The net return rate was 50.5 percent, representing from 5.7 to 9.7 percent coverage of all foster family homes within individual states and an overall sample of 7.1 percent of all foster family homes within the region.

Table 2-1

The 64 County Foster Family Sample: Total Numbers and Questionnaire Return Rates by States and Region

State	State Total Licensed F. Homes	Sample Counties Total Licensed F. Homes	Counties as % of State Total	N	Counties' Return Rate: N as % of Counties' Total	Counties' Return Rate: N as % of State Total
Ala.	1,938	285	14.7	189	66.3	9.7
Fla.	3,137	532	16.9	232	43.6	7.3
Ga.	2,012	265	13.1	135	50.9	6.7
Ky.	2,057	199	9.6	119	59.7	5.7
Miss.	850[1]	123	114.4	49	39.8	5.7
N.C.	3,482	512	14.7	236	46.0	6.7
S.C.	970	175	18.0	77	44.0	7.9
Tenn.	1,786	194	10.8	118	60.8	6.6
Totals	16,232	2,285	14.0	1,155	50.5	7.1

[1]Estimate

Similar data for our foster child sample are presented in Table 2-2.

Overall coverage of foster children is quite similar to that for foster family homes, although variation in coverage among the states is far more marked.

Our county clusters contain 14.1 percent of all foster children currently in care within the region, and our return rate of 50.6 percent yielded information on 7.1 percent of the regionwide population.

However, greater variations occurred in collecting data on the total number of children in care within each state's cluster of counties, the within state variation ranging from 28.2 to 85.2 percent.

A final way to examine the representativeness of the sample numerically is in terms of geographic spread (metropolitan-urban-rural) within the 64 counties, as presented in Table 2-3.

Cutting the data in this way reveals a moderate over representation in return rates for rural foster families and foster children.

Given the relatively large number of foster families and foster children within each population level, however, this factor may be considered a minor influence upon the validity of comparative analyses across counties controling for population size as presented in the body of the report.

In general, we believe these data demonstrate that data collection procedures yielded sufficient comprehensiveness in terms of numbers and representativeness in terms of geographic spread to support cautious generalizations about foster family care programs throughout the region.

Demographic Characteristics

Unfortunately, states could provide very little in the way of statewide statistics on the demographic characteristics of foster families and foster children.

The best that can be done is to determine whether the sample for which we have data deviates in any material

Table 2-2

The 64 County Foster Child Sample: Total Numbers and Questionnaire Return Rates by States and Region

State	State Total Foster Children	Sample Counties Total Foster Children	% Counties of State Total	N	Counties' Return Rate: N as % of Counties' Total	Counties' Return Rate: N as % of State Total
Ala.	4,201	513	12.2	431	84.0	10.2
Fla.	7,288	1,388	19.0	525	37.8	7.2
Ga.	3,716	408	10.9	348	85.2	9.3
Ky.	3,814	307	8.0	243	79.1	6.3
Miss.	1,805	219	12.1	63	28.7	3.4
N.C.	6,003	1,214	20.2	343	28.2	5.7
S.C.	2,083	236	11.3	150	63.5	7.2
Tenn.	3,001	238	7.9	188	78.9	6.2
Totals	31,911	4,523	14.1	2,291	50.6	7.1

Table 2-3

The 64 County Foster Family and Foster Child Sample:
Total Numbers and Return Rates by County
Population Size

County Population Designation	Foster Family Sample: Sample Counties Total F. Homes	N	Return Rate: N as % of Total	Foster Child Sample: Sample Counties Total F. Children	N	Return Rate: N as % of Total
Metro (N=9)	927	420	45.3	2075	839	40.4
Urban (N=16)	686	351	51.1	1275	702	55.0
Rural (N=39)	672	384	57.1	1173	750	63.9
Totals	2285	1155	50.5	4523	2291	50.6

manner from the larger aggregate of all foster families and foster children in the 64 counties that we tapped.

Sixty-eight (68) percent of all foster family homes in the 64 county sample (N=2,288) are white and slightly better than 85 percent are two parent homes.

This compares to 67.8 percent white and 83.4 percent 2 parent homes in our sample of 1,155 foster family homes.

Percentage distributions for the total 64 county population and our obtained sample on these 2 variables, controling for population size are also highly similar, as shown in Table 2-4.

These comparisons suggest that our sample closely resembles the general character of foster family homes in the 64 selected counties.

Similar comparisons of distributions for foster children in the following table for age, sex, and race provide further evidence that our sample reflects the basic characteristics of the overall population from which it was obtained.

Summary of Foster Parent Sample Characteristics

Race & Parental Status

As previously noted, 67.8 percent of the 1,155 foster families in our sample are white, and 83.4 percent are 2 parent homes. Only two families represent mixed race marriage.

Among white families, 91.3 percent are 2 parent homes, while the figure for black 2 parent homes is 66.7 percent, indicating a higher agency reliance upon use of single parent black foster family homes.

Own Children

The vast majority of foster parents have had natural children (92.4 percent), and 42.5 percent of that total currently have an average of two natural children at home.

Table 2-4

The 64 County Foster Family Sample: Percent Distributions for Total Population and Obtained Sample for Race and Parental Status, by County Population Size

	White		Black		
	2 par. %T/%S	1 par. %T/%S	2 par. %T/%S	1 par. %T/%S	
Metro	66.3/63.8	5.0/5.6	18.0/19.0	12.5/11.2	100.0
Urban	60.0/57.4	4.4/3.8	23.1/25.8	12.7/11.4	100.0
Rural	67.2/64.0	7.2/8.0	19.2/18.6	7.9/ 8.8	100.0
Totals	65.1/62.5	5.2/5.8	18.7/20.9	11.0/10.4	100.0

Table 2-5

The 64 County Foster Child Sample: Percent Distributions for Total Population and Obtained Sample for Race, Sex, and Age, by County Population Size

	Child's Race			Child's Sex		Child's Age			
	White %T/%S	Black %T/%S	Other & Mixed %T/%S	Male %T/%S	Female %T/%S	-1 %T/%S	1-5 %T/%S	6-12 %T/%S	13+ %T/%S
Metro	66.6/62.2	31.4/34.5	3.0/3.4	55.1/54.0	44.9/46.0	8.7/5.5	20.3/28.5	42.8/41.1	24.2/24.6
Urban	58.0/52.6	39.4/43.9	2.6/3.3	52. /52.5	47.1/47.5	5.2/5.5	16.9/28.5	51.3/36.8	26.7/29.0
Rural	66.5/65.0	33.5/34.6	- / .4	51.7/49.0	48.3/51.0	3.8/4.8	20.7/22.0	44.5/43.3	30.7/30.0
Totals	64.0/60.1	34.0/37.4	2.0/2.5	53.0/51.9	47.0/48.1	6.4/5.3	19.5/26.5	46.6/40.5	27.5/27.7

Age

Most foster parents are middle aged: 72.8 percent of all foster mothers and 76.2 percent of all foster fathers fall into the 31-60 age bracket. Roughly 14 percent of all foster mothers and 12 percent of all foster fathers are under age 30 or over age 61 respectively.

Number of Years Licensed and Type of License

Most foster parents in our sample are experienced, at least in terms of the length of time they have been licensed to care for foster children. Only 8.7 percent have had their licenses less than 1 year. Over 50 percent (52.1) have been licensed between 1 and 5 years, 21 percent between 5 and 10 years, and 18.2 percent over 10 years.

Nearly all foster parents hold standard licenses. Slightly less than 2.5 percent of all foster family homes have specialized agreements to care for special or exceptional children.

Income

Slightly over one-half (53.8 percent) of all foster families in our sample have aggregate family incomes--exclusive of agency foster care payments--in excess of $8,000 yearly.

Of that number, 24.9 percent are in the $8-11,999 bracket 16.2 percent between $12-15,999, and 12.7 percent over $16,000.

Among the foster families having less than $8,000 yearly income (46.2 percent), 21.5 percent claim less than $4,000 per year.

Education

Roughly 36 percent of all foster mothers (36.7) and foster fathers (36.0) have completed grade school only.

More foster mothers (51.6 percent) than foster fathers (46.0 percent) are high school graduates, while more foster

fathers (17.8 percent) than foster mothers (11.5 percent) have college degrees.

Foster Parent Association Affiliations

Only 13.6 percent (N=157) of our foster parents are members of the National Foster Parent Association.

A substantially larger percentage (48.3) indicates local foster parent associations are operational in their counties and of that percentage 235--or 42.2 percent--say they are members.

While it would not be useful to sketch a "typical" foster family from these data, it is clear that the bulk of foster families is white, 2 parent in structure, moderately well educated with average incomes or above, and substantial foster parenting experience.

These general characteristics are rather evenly distributed across metropolitan, urban and rural counties throughout the sample.

Summary of Foster Child Sample Characteristics

Foster parents provided the data on foster children utilized in this study by filling out a blue sheet on each foster child currently within their care.

The 1,155 foster families in our sample reported a total of 2,388 children currently in care and returned completed blue sheets on 2,291 foster children representing 95.9 percent of the total.

To simplify and speed up data processing operations, we decided to limit data aggregation on blue sheets to a maximum of 4 children per foster family. This resulted in a net loss of 281 children residing in foster homes containing 5 or more foster children and reduced the overall sample to 2,010 children or 84.1 percent of all children in the 1,155 reporting foster family homes.

The following tables indicate our foster child sample to be predominantly white, to be rather evenly divided between boys and girls, and to be composed largely of preteens.

School grade distributions closely follow age distributions and further show small percentages of foster children currently attending special classes.

Finally, from the standpoint of length of stay, information from foster parents for 1827 children indicates that 38.7 percent have been in care at least 2 years or longer.

As will be discussed later in this report when the current yearly foster child turnover rate of 31.5 percent is discussed, our sample would appear to be composed of three segments, one-third being rapid turnover cases, one-third in care a short time but headed for long-term care, and one-third already long-term cases.

As was the case with the foster family sample, there seem to be no outstanding differences in the distribution of foster child characteristics across metropolitan, urban, and rural settings.

Table 2-6

The Foster [illegible]ld Sample: Sex and Race Distribut[illegible] by County Population Size (Number and %)

		Sex		Race			
	N	Male	Female	White	Black	Mixed	Other
Metro	736	398 (54.0)	338 (46.0)	458 (62.2)	254 (34.5)	18 (2.4)	6 (1.0)
Urban	616	324 (52.5)	292 (47.5)	324 (52.5)	271 (43.9)	18 (2.9)	3 (.4)
Rural	658	323 (49.0)	335 (51.0)	428 (65.0)	228 (34.6)	2 (.3)	- (.0)
Totals	2010	1045 (51.9)	965 (48.1)	1210 (60.1)	753 (37.4)	38 (2.0)	9 (.4)

Table 2-7

The Foster Child Sample: Age Distribution by County Population Size (Number and %)

	N	Under 1 yr.	1-5 yrs.	6-12 yrs.	13-18 yrs.	19+
Metro	736	41 (5.5)	210 (28.5)	303 (41.1)	174 (23.6)	8 (1.0)
Urban	616	34 (5.5)	176 (28.5)	227 (36.8)	173 (28.0)	6 (1.0)
Rural	658	32 (4.8)	145 (22.0)	285 (43.3)	191 (29.0)	5 (1.0)
Totals	2010	107 (5.3)	531 (26.4)	815 (40.5)	538 (26.7)	19 (1.0)

Table 2-8

The Foster Child Sample: School Grade Distribution by County Population Size (Number and %)

		Grades						
	N	Pre-School	1-5	6-8	9-12	Special Classes	Drop Out	Voc. School
Metro	623	128 (20.5)	212 (34.0)	110 (17.6)	97 (15.5)	63 (10.1)	4 (.6)	9 (1.4)
Urban	523	121 (23.1)	155 (29.6)	95 (18.1)	110 (21.0)	40 (7.6)	1 (.1)	1 (.1)
Rural	576	104 (18.0)	192 (33.3)	119 (20.6)	114 (19.7)	42 (7.2)	3 (.5)	2 (.3)
Totals	1722	353 (20.4)	559 (32.4)	324 (18.8)	321 (18.6)	145 (8.4)	8 (.4)	12 (.6)

Table 2-9

The Foster Child Sample: Length of Stay
by County Population Size
(Number and %)

	N	In Months: Under 6	7-12	13-24	25-36	37-48	49-60	61+
Metro	676	186 (27.5)	92 (13.6)	133 (19.6)	73 (10.7)	39 (5.7)	28 (4.1)	125 (18.9)
Urban	536	161 (30.0)	81 (15.1)	96 (17.9)	53 (9.8)	46 (8.5)	23 (4.2)	76 (14.1)
Rural	615	166 (26.9)	107 (17.3)	94 (15.2)	72 (11.7)	44 (7.1)	27 (4.3)	105 (17.0)
Totals	1827	513 (28.0)	280 (15.3)	323 (17.6)	198 (10.8)	129 (7.0)	78 (4.2)	306 (16.7)

CHAPTER III

THE CURRENT SUPPLY OF FOSTER FAMILY HOMES

Three factors have immediate determining effects on the current supply of foster family homes, namely, funding, recruitment, and licensing.

A fourth factor, the role of the foster parent, illustrates the nature of the current supply of foster family homes lying beneath the facts and figures.

From the specific standpoint of this study, it is important to assess the impact of these factors upon the development and provision of existing foster family services to children in the Southeast. From this assessment estimates can be made of the capacity within the current supply for serving children with special needs.

Foster Family Care Funding

Regular foster family care board rates in the 8 states of Region IV vary little in terms of standard or minimum levels although some variation does exist in states that provide a range of payments, 5 states make provision for special board rates for specific needs and two states provide a service fee within highly specific program limits as noted in Table 3-1.

Financial sources supporting board rates, special board rate and service fee payments are shown on the following page for the 8 states in Region IV.

From a policy standpoint, in 3 states supplimentation of regular or special board rates to pay service fees is not allowed. In 4 other states supplimentation is allowed but not practiced because of a lack of funds, and in 1 state supplimentation by non-state funds is allowed on an emergency, special or exceptions basis only.

Notes on Rate Setting

Generally speaking, board rates are not negotiated on a case by case basis, although the financial assets of natural parents and foster children are evaluated and periodically reevaluated to determine whether these sources can contribute

to the cost of care and to assess whether case payments will be made from AFDC-FC or state foster family care program funds.

Table 3-1

Regular and Special Foster Family Care Board Rate and Service Fee Provisions & Payment Levels, by States, FY '76

	Regular Board Rate (Range)	Special Board Rate	Service Fee
Ala.	95.00	60.00 mo. (nursing care)	30.00-regular, 50.00-special, up to 300.00 per mo. (out-of-home care)
Fla.	98.00-133.00	15.00 mo., for children needs/ extra effort	None
Ga.	102.00-133.50	.50-1.75 day, special diets	125.00 per mo., limited to 20 homes
Ky.	96.50-128.50	.75 to 3.85 per day, or up to 118.50 mo.	None
Miss.	123.00	None	None
N.C.	100.00	None	None
S.	90.00	None	None
[illegible]n.	95.00-156.00	Up to 206.00 mo.	None

	Regular Board Rates (8 states)	Special Board Rates (5 states)	Service Fees (2 states)
State & Federal mix + other where applicable (VA, Soc. Sec., etc)	5		
All of above + county supplimentation	3		
State & Federal Mix		3	
State Funds & County Suppliment		1	
State Funds & City Optional Suppliments		1	
State funds only			1
State & Federal where appropriate			1

Support from natural parents, if determined feasible by such a review, is normally fixed through a court proceeding and support judgment.

Funds obtained in this way are commonly paid directly to the state and do not affect the size of the board payment.

Similarly, child owned financial assets are normally court supervised and used to provide for a child's special or otherwise non-reimbursed needs. This approach has no effect on the size of the regular board rate payment either.

What Do These Rates Pay For?

The following table shows what state programs pay for in terms of foster child care services and services directly provided by foster parents.

Note that the majority of states either do not provide--or else leave it up to counties to suppliment--a variety of foster child related services having to do with medical, schooling, religion, and entertainment matters.

Further, very few services given directly by foster parents are covered by state program funding provisions, or for that matter, by county optional supplimentation.

Finally, Table 3-3 gives some general information on specific types of medical services and the extent to which states cover them through medicaid or other funding mixes.

Our 64 county sample provides a further insight into the scarcity of supplimental payments for foster family care.

While special board rates are provided on occasion in 34.3 percent of the counties (22 of 64), most funding for these rates comes from state sources. Only 6 counties provide special board rate suppliments out of county funds.

Similarly, service fees are provided from county funds in 14.0 percent of the counties (9 of 64).

In all 1 metropolitan, 4 urban, and 8 rural counties provide special board rates and/or service fees out of local funds, representing roughly 20 percent of our county sample.

Foster Family Home Recruitment Efforts

For the most part it would be more accurate to talk about recruitment activities during FY '76 in terms of appeals rather than campaigns in as much as the vast majority of such activities were ad hoc and lacked the planning, organization, and geographic/population coverage ordinarily descriptive of the latter term.

Table 3-2

Method of Payment by Number of States and Cost Item

Type of Foster Parent/Foster Family Care Service (additional to shelter and food services assumed covered by board rates in all states)	Standardized State Regular and/or Special Board Rates	Standardized State Fees or Allowances Additional to Board Rates	State Exceptions Payments on Merits of Individual request Basis	Local (County) Option, County Payment	No Reimbursement	NA
Clothing						
-Initial (at Placement clothing costs		4		2	2	
-Clothing Replacement costs	5	1		3		
Medical						
-Medicine/Treatments not reimbursed by medicaid			5	2	1	
-Foster parent transportation costs to visit hospitalized children and consult with doctors, therapists, etc., and to carry foster child to medical appointments			1	4	3	
-Provision of special diets	3			2	2	1
-Routine medicine chest items	4			2	2	
School						
-Fees and other costs for special education, tutoring, etc.			5	2	1	
-Foster parent transportation costs for taking child to school, school events and to meet with school officials			2	4	2	
Religion						
-Foster parent transportation and activity costs for foster child religious instruction					8	
Child Entertainment						
-Child allowances	4			3	1	
-Child membership and other fees	3			3	1	1
-Other entertainment expenses (Vacation, summer camp, movie, etc.)				3	5	

Method of Payment by Number of States and Cost Item (Cont.)

Type of Foster Parent/Foster Family Care Service (additional to shelter and food services assumed covered by board rates in all states)	Standardized State Regular and/or Special Board Rates	Standardized State Fees or Allowances Additional to Board Rates	State Exceptions Payments on Merits of Individual request Basis	Local (County) Option, County Payment	No Reimbursement	NA
Foster Parent Direct Service Costs						
-Foster parent costs incurred in visits to or other work with natural parent	1				4	3
-Foster parents membership/transportation costs for involvement in foster parent associations					8	
-Foster parent transportation and other costs for visits to and participation in agency case planning					8	
-Foster parent work in agency foster parent recruitment and promotional work					6	2
-Foster parent involvement in local foster care review boards, joint planning committees, etc.					6	2
-Foster parent attendance at foster care training workshops, conferences, etc.		2		3	3	
-Foster parent training of new agency foster parents		1		1	4	2
-Foster parent Medical exams to meet licensing requirements					8	
-Foster parent liability insurance costs, or repayment for foster child damage to property		1		1	6	
-Foster parent legal costs, if needed in litigation involving natural parent complaints, etc.					8	
-Foster parent legal costs incurred in adopting foster child				1	7	
-foster parent medical insurance				1	7	

Table 3-3

Selected Medical Service Payment Provisions, by States, FY '76

Total	Total No. of States	None	Medicaid Only	State Special Payments[1]	Local Option/ Payments
General Medical	8		4		4
Emergency Medical	8		2	3	3
Dental	8		1	3	4
Special Medication	8		1	2	5
Prosthetic Device	8		2	2	3
Orthodontics Problem	8	1	1	2	3

[1]On an exceptions basis for individual cases only.

State office personnel across the 8 states report very little overall recruitment activity either on the part of their own staffs or through the use of other resources during the year.

Three (3) states report no recruitment efforts of any sort.

A somewhat higher level of overall recruitment effort was reported locally among the 64 counties in our sample, although 25 of the 64 counties (39.0 percent) also indicated no activity throughout the year.

By and large, both states and counties relied upon their own staffs to carry out recruitment appeals. Over 79 percent (79.3) of all state activities and 77.5 percent of all county activities were undertaken by staff.

Table 3-4 provides a breakdown of recruitment activities by type reported by states and counties during FY '76.

A further breakdown of county recruitment activities discloses that 8 of 9 (88.8 percent) metropolitan counties carried out some type of effort during the year compared to 69.8 percent of urban counties (11 of 16) and 51.3 percent of rural counties (20 of 39).

A relatively small proportion of all of these activities was specifically targeted toward recruiting foster families to serve children with special needs, as shown in Table 3-5.

These data indicate that 44.4 percent of state level recruitment activities of all types was targeted at soliciting foster family homes for children with special needs, while the figure for our sample of counties was 25.1 percent.

Given the low overall level of state activity, and the general haphazard nature of recruitment appeals at both state and local levels, it is clear that little organized emphasis was placed upon recruiting foster family homes for children with special needs throughout the region during FY '76.

It is also noteworthy that no appeal of any sort was directed toward soliciting new applicants to serve delinquent children.

The Net Effect of Recruitment on Foster Family Home Supply

In spite of the limited nature of current recruitment efforts, existing data indicate that both states and counties in our sample are succeeding in increasing their overall supply of foster family homes.

The 5 states in Region IV reporting complete data experienced a net gain of 963 homes, or a 10.3 percent growth rate during FY '76, and a license approval to revocation-withdrawal ratio of 1.46:1.00, as shown in Table 3-6.

Table 3-4

State and County Foster Family Recruitment Appeals by Type and Geographic Coverage for FY '76

Type of Appeal	Area Coverage by: States (N=8) State/ wide	States (N=8) District/ wide	States (N=8) County	Counties (N=64) County/ wide	Counties (N=64) Single City/Org. or Group
By Own Staff					
Newspaper ads:	-	4	1	17	7
features:	-	1	4	33	13
TV ads:	-	2	6	13	7
features:	1	-	6	9	1
Radio ads:	-	2	-	21	16
features:	1	2	1	14	4
Speaking engagements lay:	-	1	4	25	31
professional:	-	1	7	19	30
Distribution of phamphlets/ brochures	-	-	1	19	16
Community Canvas	-	2	5	8	5
Other Resources Used					
Marketing Consultants	1	-	1	2	1
Foster Parents	-	-	4	35	15
Volunteers	-	1	2	4	5
Prof. Ass'ns/ PVT Agencies	-	-	-	3	6
Other Pub. Agencies	-	-	-	2	1
No Effort	3			25	

Table 3-5

Total Number of State and County Recruitment Appeals Specific to Serving Children with Special Needs, by Type of Child

Specific Target of Appeal	Number of Appeals: States (N=8)	Counties (N=64)
Ethnic/Racial Minorities	4	6
Emot. Dist. Child	5	18
Phys. Handi. Child	3	13
M.R. Child	4	14
Delinquent Child	-	-
Infants	2	6
Adolescent Males	5	21
Adolescent Females	5	22
Totals	28	100

Table 3-6

Net Change in the Number of Licensed Foster Family Homes by State, FY '76

	No. of Licensed Homes 7-1-75	No. of New Homes Approved	No. of License Revocations/ Withdrawals	No. of Licensed Homes 7-1-76	Net Gain/Loss
Ala.	1,857	--	--	--	--
Fla.	2,130	927	529	2,528	+398
Ga.	1,839	567	401	2,005	+166
Ky.	--	--	--	--	--
Miss.	--	--	--	--	--
N.C.	2,803	832	696	2,939	+136
S.C.	917	271	221	967	+ 50
Tenn.	1,573	521	308	1,786	+213
Totals	9,262[1]	3,118	2,155	10,225	+963

[1]Totals for 5 states with complete data.

Similar data for our 64 county sample indicate an overall growth rate of 12.0 percent and a license approval to revocation-withdrawal ratio of 1.66:1.00.

Table 3-7 also shows that net increases in numbers of foster family homes were achieved in all types of counties within the sample.

County supplied data further indicate that a total of 1,261 applications was received during the year, 191 of which were still pending at the time the data were reported.

Table 3-7

Net Change in the Number of Licensed Foster Family Homes in 64 Counties, by County Population Size, FY '76

	N	No. of Licensed Homes 7-1-75	No. of New Homes Approved	No. of License Revocations/ Withdrawals	No. of Licensed Homes 7-1-76	Net Gain/Loss N	%
Metro	9	826	286	151	959	+133	(16.1)
Urban	16	567	150	106	611	+ 44	(7.7)
Rural	39	684	193	121	758	+ 74	(10.8)
Totals	64	2,077	629	378	2,328	251	(12.0)

Of the remaining 1,070 applications, 629 (58.8 percent) were approved for licenses, 144 (13.5 percent) were rejected, and 297 (27.7 percent) represented withdrawals.

Broken down by county population size, these data show that rural counties received the fewest applications and responded with the highest approval and lowest rejection rates, as shown in Table 3-8.

Table 3-8

License Application Approval, Rejection, and Withdrawal Rates in 64 Counties by County Population Size, FY '76

	No. of Counties	No. of Applications	% of Total Approved	% of Total Rejections	% of Total Withdrawals
Metro	9	388	64.7	11.6	23.7
Urban	16	411	46.8	18.8	34.4
Rural	39	271	71.7	8.1	20.2
Totals	64	1,070	58.8	13.5	27.7

In the absence of state level data, these are the best summaries that can be supplied on rejection and withdrawal rates relative to applications for foster family care licenses in the Southeast.

Success in terms of increasing overall numbers does not, of course, tell the whole story.

Of equal--or perhaps more--interest is the kind of person or family approved to provide foster family care.

Data presented in Chapter II indicate that 2 parent families composed of a working husband and a housewife predominate, at least in our county sample of 1,155 foster families.

Specifically, licensed single parent foster homes number only 186 or 16.1 percent of our sample. According to available data, 118 single parent foster homes (63.4 percent) are black, and almost all (172 or 92.4 percent) are female headed.

A further note on race: only 2 of 969 two parent foster homes are mixed race couples.

Finally, nearly all licensed foster parents have had their own children and a majority has comfortable incomes (above $8,000 annually) independent of family foster care board rate payments.

Indeed, among our 64 counties, the most frequent reason given for rejecting applications is the economic inadequacy of the applicant(s).

To the extent that these data are generalizable to the Southeast, they indicate, in combine with previous data on recruitment efforts, a very conservative approach to the development and maintenance of the supply of foster family homes.

Although there has been numerical growth, it may well be justifiable to conclude that such growth represents a "more of the same" approach rather than any clear effort to tap atypical or non-traditional potential sources for foster family homes.

Given the national trends relative to marital breakdown and the movement of women into the work force, which are now also being felt in the Southeast, it is worth conjecturing how much longer current selection criteria and recruitment efforts will serve to generate the type of foster family home supply on which states presently rely.

Foster Family Home Licensing Procedures

As noted in Table 3-9, no two states follow the same approach and set of procedures in licensing and relicensing foster family homes.

By and large, responsibility for initial home studies and relicensing reviews is vested in local agency operations while direct state involvement is more obviously present in matters of granting licenses initially and upon reapplication.

One matter of some concern is the absence of state involvement in revocation and appeals proceedings in all but 2 states.

In practice, primary responsibility in the licensing/relicensing process is vested in county agencies or their equivalents in states organized on a district or regional basis.

These agencies have historically controlled the bulk of official direct contacts with both applicants and licensed foster parents leading to a well articulated division of labor.

Table 3-9

Foster Family Home Licensing and Review Process, by States, FY '76

	Home Study Conducted By	Home Study Approval	Who Grants License	Who Conducts Licensing Reviews	Who Approves Licensing Review	Who Grants Relicense/ Reapproval	Who Denies/ Revokes	Who Hears Appeal/ Denial
State		1	4		1	3	1	1
District		3	1		1			
State & County	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1
District & County		1	1	2	3	2	2	
St/Dist/ & County						1	3	3
County[1]	7	1	1	5	1	1		1
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2[2]

[1]Or equivalent type local unit in decentralized state system
[2]No procedure cited in 2 states

This tradition poses a substantial barrier to state officials relative to intervention in the licensing process and leads, in practice, to states exercising control mainly over minimum standards for foster family homes as stipulated in state regulations.

In the Southeast, state regulations primarily govern such licensing criteria as the physical adequacy of the home and the maximum number and type (age, sex, etc.) of foster children allowable within individual homes, and license expiration dates.

It is left essentially to the counties to determine--formally or informally--whether applicants and licensed foster parents are qualified and able to provide adequate care for foster children.

Additionally, state regulations throughout the Southeast provide for few enforcement powers, and, in some states governmental reorganization has separated state foster family care officials from line operations consigning them to planning, consulting, and paper shuffling roles.

The net result of these traditions and structural limitations is a severe restriction of state leadership in controling the quality of foster family home supply through the licensing/relicensing mechanism.

These weaknesses are apparent in the licensing of locally operated public and private foster family care programs as well.

Table 3-10 indicates, for example, that in three states private placement agencies may grant foster family home licenses without state approval and that a fourth state has only review responsibilities in such matters.[11]

---

[11]While data on private agency foster family care programs is lacking in most states, data for one state--Florida--suggest that such programs are of material size.

At the beginning of FY '76, for example, Florida had 410 privately licensed foster family homes. During the year 198 new applications were processed and 134 revocations/withdrawals were reported, leaving a balance of 474 such homes as of July 1, 1976.

Table 3-10

State Licensing Responsibility for Independently Operated Foster Family Home Programs, FY '76

Type of State Licensing Involvement	Type of Program Auspices: County Run Program	City Run Program	Private Agency	Children's Inst. with F. Child Placement Program
Agency Approval Only	1	1	3	1
State Licensing Required	4	3	3	4
Agency Approval/ State Review			1	1
No State Involvement	2			
No Such Program	1	4	1	2

Although a number of states require licensing of locally funded public foster family care programs, our review indicates that states have little or no authority to intervene such programs relative to monitoring program quality or enforcing state standards.

Finally, 7 of the 8 states also issue temporary or time limited licenses to homes *not* meeting state standards when children are already in a home at the time a license application is made.

Table 3-11 gives the mix of conditions by the number of state utilizing them.

While 4 states appear to follow the practice of issuing licenses/approvals to homes not meeting minimum standards without imposing a requirement to meet such standards in a set time period, in most cases such a requirement is imposed.

At the same time, no state provides funding to such foster homes to assist them in upgrading their facilities to meet minimum standards.

Table 3-11

Conditions Under Which States Provide Licenses/Approvals to Foster Family Homes that Do *Not* Meet State Minimum Standards

	No. of States	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3
		Issued with understanding that family will meet standards within a set time period - applies when children are already present and prior to placement.	Issued only when children are already in home at time of application and agreement is reached to meet standards in a set time period.	Issued only when children are already in home at time of application, and *no* requirement is imposed to meet standards.
Under no condition	1			
Under condition 1 only	2			
Under conditions 2 & 3	1			
Under all conditions	4			

Neither state officials nor county officials in our sample expressed dissatisfaction with general licensing practices or procedures as we have outlined them.

Most were satisfied that the process moved swiftly enough--an average of 1 to 3 months from application to final decision in most states--and county officials in particular noted bureaucratic red tape to be the *least influential factor* governing the processing of licensing/relicensing paper work.

In fact, the major bottleneck in the process according to county officials is the persistent lack of skilled personnel needed to conduct initial and review home studies.

Reasons for License Rejections, Revocations, and Voluntary Withdrawals

States have no readily available data that could provide insights on why applications and licenses are rejected or revoked, or why applicants and licensed foster parents voluntarily withdraw.

Because of this lack, we again turn to information reported by the counties, in this case 42 of the 64 counties.

According to this information source, initial applications and existing foster home licenses are rarely rejected or revoked for reasons related to state minimum standards, as shown in Table 3-12.

Rather, these decisions mostly follow from some action or decision made by the foster family or the imposition of a criterion developed or interpreted in application by the county agency.

Again, according to county officials, applicants and licensed foster homes appear to voluntarily withdraw most frequently for personal reasons, rather than as a response to agency standards or actions, as shown in Table 3-13.

One reason commonly given for all of these actions is that of relocation of the applicant or licensed foster family.

Other data presented later in this study tend to confirm that county agencies rarely allow foster children to remain with foster parents when they relocate, especially if the relocation is out of county or out of state. (Only 7 percent of all out of county placement approvals are for the reason of relocating with existing foster parents.)

Since such decisions are largely up to the county in most states, a question arises whether this practice represents wise planning or simply arbitrary removal of children from existing care arrangements.

A Note on Contracting with Foster Parents

Throughout this section reference has been made to weaknesses and limitations in the licensing/relicensing process.

Recently (effective July 1, 1976), the state of Kentucky adopted a new system of contracting with each foster family in an effort to tighten the monitoring and regulation of foster family care throughout the state.

Table 3-12

Reasons for Application Rejection/License Revocation in Declining Order of Frequency of Use by County Agencies (N=42 Counties)

	Most Frequent Reasons for:		
	Application Rejection		License Revocations
1.	Inadequate Economic Condition of Home	1.	Relocation of Foster Family
2.	Dissolution of Family	2.	Dissolution of Foster Family
3.	Age of Applicants	3.	Unwillingness to Accept Available Children
4.	Lack of Adequate Housing	4.	Age of Foster Parents
5.	Relocation of Family	5.	Death of Foster Parent(s)

Table 3-13

Reasons for Voluntary Withdrawals in Declining Order of Frequency of Use by Applicants and Licensed Foster Family Homes

	Most Frequent Reasons for:		
	Application Withdrawal		Licensed Home Withdrawal
1.	Relocation of Family	1.	Dissolution of Foster Family
2.	Unwillingness to Accept Available Children	2.	Relocation of Foster Family
3.	Inadequate Economic Condition of the Home	3.	Bad experience with Foster Children
4.	Inadequate Board Rate	4.	Unwillingness to Accept Available Children
5.	Dissolution of Family	5.	Age of Foster Parent(s)

The contract sets forth more specifically the conditions of care than had been the case in the past and requires the signatures of the Commissioner, the local agency worker, the foster parent(s), and a member of the state's legal staff.

Additionally, a supplement to the contract is signed by each foster child in the home.

It is obviously too early to tell what effect this approach will have, yet it is worthy of mention as an example of one state's efforts to improve upon its licensing/relicensing process.

Licensing Foster Family Homes for Children with Special Needs

At the time that data were gathered from the states for this report (March, 1976), only 2 of the 8 states reported state level involvement in the issuing of specialized foster family home licenses, and this involvement was very limited and generally unstructured in nature.

Tennessee indicated that specialized foster family home licenses are approved on occasion and on a case by case basis although criteria for making such decisions are not formalized as uniform state standards. This state had no data available on the number of such homes presently licensed in operation.

Georgia reported that it had identified and licensed 20 foster family homes specifically to handle children with emotional and behavioral problems. Each of these homes receives an additional financial supplement in recognition of the special nature of the service provided.

The remaining 6 states indicated that they did not issue specialized foster family care licenses, and they did not then have any established standards or sets of criteria for identifying or monitoring such homes.

Generally speaking, all states recognized that local agencies were using foster family homes with standard licenses for specialized purposes, such as emergency care, permanent care, and/or to serve children with special needs.

No state had data, however, on how--or to what extent--local agencies were utilizing their foster homes in this manner.

If our data for 64 counties are any indication, the conclusion would be that counties are not exercising this apparent local option to any significant degree.

Among the 1,155 foster families within those 64 counties who provided us with data, 1,118 or 96.8 percent indicated they had neither a specialized license nor had they entered into any formal or informal agreement with the local agency to serve children with special needs.

Of the remaining 37 families, 18 had specialized licenses and 19 had made informal agreements with local agencies.

Overall, these families are currently serving a total of 29 children, including 12 who are mentally retarded, 7 who are physically handicapped, and 10 who are emotionally disturbed.

No home in the sample is serving adjudicated delinquents.

While some specialized uses of foster family homes may well have escaped our attention, it seems justified to conclude that in practical terms, specialized foster family care is virtually nonexistent in the Southeast.

The Current Role of the Foster Parent

Agency Supports

Drawing upon our discussions with state officials, it seems fair to conclude that no state in the Southeast has a clear understanding or a coherent definition of the role of the foster parent.

Rather, major unresolved conflicts surface in such discussions. One such conflict centers on whether the foster parent is a vendor or an agency staff person. This is not an either/or matter, but one of degree.

States are actively supporting increased foster parent involvement in such matters as case planning and are developing liaison relationships with foster parent associations.

Foster parents themselves report substantial involvement: 753--or 65.6 percent--of the 1,155 foster families indicate they are regularly involved in agency case planning for the foster children in their care.

The extent to which they are *meaningfully* involved in such matters, however, is open to question.

For example, only 26.1 percent (N=301) of all our foster families were told how long they could expect a foster child to stay with them at point of placement; and, in 43.4 percent of these cases (N=131) children exceeded this expectation by more than 6 months.

Further, large percentages of foster families claim that relevant information was not shared with them about the foster children in their care, as shown in Table 3-14.

Involvement in case planning is difficult without adequate information. Such data suggest that an increasing role for foster parents in agency decision making processes may be more appearance than reality.

The provision of fringe benefits provides a different view or measure of the degree of foster parent involvement in agency processes.

In this regard, no state provides or pays foster parents to provide such benefits as medical care, hospitalization, life, liability or other insurance, retirement, sick leave or unemployment coverage.[12]

---

[12]One Exception: Georgia does pay liability insurance for foster parents. Similar coverage is provided in Kentucky by that state's Foster Parent Association. North Carolina indicated that its program is county operated and some counties may provide some of these benefits with local funds.

Foster parents confirm these data and provide further elaboration. For example, of the 1,155 foster parents reporting to us, 72.0 percent indicate they have *no* liability

Clearly the foster parent falls into a special class of vendor relative to fringe benefits, inasmuch as states frequently underwrite such costs in doing business by contract with a wide variety of other types of vendors.

Another substantial source of conflict centers upon whether states consider foster parents service providers, simple caretakers, or caregivers in the role of substitute parents.

This matter, as broadly covered in Chapter I, is of concern nationally and involves a number of unresolved legal and policy issues.

If foster parents are to be considered substitute parents, then a number of issues has to be resolved about whether or not foster family care is to be considered temporary and about the impact the development of foster parent-foster child emotional bonds has upon replacement of the child with natural parents or to other settings.

What are the foster parent's rights and responsibilities relative to child control and discipline and his legal liabilities *vis a vis* the agency and natural parents when he functions as substitute parent?

If foster parents are to be considered service providers, what services are they qualified to deliver, and how would this role alter their relationships with their agencies?

If foster parents are to function as simple caretakers, who will provide the necessary parenting and other services while children are in foster care?

These and related matters are of high concern to foster parents themselves.

---

coverage, 22.7 percent say they pay for it themselves, and only 5.3 percent indicate their agencies absorb the cost.

Additionally, only 2.2 percent and 3.7 percent of the sample indicate that their agencies pay for relief foster parents and the costs incurred in meeting state health/safety housing standards respectively.

Table 3-14

Percentages of Foster Families Saying They Have not Received Adequate Information about Foster Children in Their Care, by Types of Information and County Population Size

Type of County	No. of Foster Families	% Saying Information is Inadequate about: Birth Verfi-cation	Nat'l Par. Back-ground	Eating/ Sleeping Habits	Social/ Ethnic Back-ground	Medical History	Special Behavior Problems
Metro	420	45.3	61.5	67.6	53.6	60.0	57.7
Urban	351	47.0	65.8	65.2	56.9	65.9	59.1
Rural	384	48.2	58.4	62.3	53.7	52.5	55.0
Totals	1,155	46.8	61.8	65.5	54.6	59.1	57.3

For example, when our sample of foster parents was asked to indicate the types of training that would be most useful to them in carrying out their functions, they indicated, as shown in Table 3-15, the following 4 topics as most important.

Table 3-15

Types of Training Most Desired
by Foster Parents
(N=1,155)

Training Topic	% Desiring
Methods of Child Supervision/Discipline	99.0
Foster Parent Legal Rights/Responsibilities	95.0
State Laws/Agency Policy	77.0
Foster Parent Relationship with Natural Parent(s)	67.0

In sum, there is a pressing need for states to exercise leadership in the vital area of clarifying foster parent role limits and expectations.

The development of a clear role model might well contribute to more improvement in the provision of foster family care services than any other single factor.

Services: Who Provides/Who Pays

To some extent, the role of the foster parent is defined by the ways in which services are currently provided and how they are financed. In short: to what extent is the foster parent the actual service provider and/or the financial supporter of foster family care?

Supportive Services

Supportive services, by our definition, are those services that foster children need periodically to make their life style approximate that of children living in their own homes.

We asked our 1,155 foster parents to indicate whether they regularly provide and pay for 15 types of supportive services for each of the 2,010 foster children currently in their care. The percentages of children for whom these services are provided and paid for by foster parents, for each service and across counties of different population sizes are reported in Table 3-16.

Clearly, a wide variety of supportive services is provided and funded out of pocket by foster parents, across rural, urban and metropolitan settings.

By aggregating data across all types of services we can obtain foster parents' own estimates of how much of the service/cost burden is born by them, as shown in Table 3-17.

Out of a domain of 15 services for each of 2,010 foster children, foster parents indicate that they meet slightly less than half of all supportive service needs and pay out of pocket for about one-third of all possible services to all children.

Interestingly, rural foster parents report providing fewer supportive services and incurring lower over all out of pocket expenses than their urban and metropolitan counterparts.

These data coincide with a separate over all out of pocket cost estimate we asked foster parents to make.

Once again, foster parents in the aggregate estimate that out of pocket expenses represent about one-third of total foster child care costs, with rural foster parents estimating their expenses to be slightly lower, as shown in Table 3-18.

Table 3-16

Percentage of Foster Children for Whom Foster Parents Regularly Provide and Pay for 15 Types of Supportive Services, by County Population Size

Type of Service	Totals	% of Children for Whom Service is Provided & Paid by Foster Parent(s) Metro (N=9)	Urban (N=16)	Rural (N=39)
Number of Children	2,010	736	616	658
Transportation	50.9	56.1	51.2	44.7
Special Diets	9.0	12.3	8.8	5.7
Regular Clothing	34.8	43.8	31.9	27.8
Special Clothing	25.1	33.0	23.9	17.7
Personal Grooming Needs	51.1	53.0	53.5	46.8
Recreation Activities	52.9	53.5	52.7	44.7
Recreation Equipment	41.3	48.8	39.0	35.4
Artistic Activities/ Supplies	19.5	27.1	18.8	11.9
Parties/Toys/Games	64.9	69.7	61.5	62.7
Allowances	33.8	34.5	36.1	30.9
School Expenses	39.3	45.4	40.1	31.7
School Lunches	13.0	16.1	11.6	10.9
Club Fees/Dues, etc.	32.6	39.2	32.4	25.5
Summer Camp/Vacation	36.5	48.0	32.1	27.8
Child's Legal Expenses	3.3	3.0	2.5	4.4

Table 3-17

Percentage Distribution of Foster Parents' Provision & Payment of Foster Child Supportive Services, by County Population Size

	No. of Counties	No. of Children	No. of Services	Not Provided or Someone Else Provides	% Provided by Foster Parent/and Who Pays: F.P. Provides & Pays	F.P. Provides/ Agency Pays	F.P. Provides/Nat'l Par.-Other Pays	
Metro	9	736	15	47.3	38.9	10.6	3.2	100.0
Urban	16	616	15	53.8	33.1	10.8	2.3	100.0
Rural	39	658	15	53.2	28.6	15.5	2.7	100.0
Totals	64	2,010	15	51.7	33.2	12.2	2.9	100.0

Table 3-18

Foster Parent Percentage Estimates of Total Foster Child Care Direct Costs Covered by All Agency Payments

	N	Agency Payments as % of Total Direct Costs: -25	+25 -50	About 50	+50 -75	+75 -100	100	$\bar{x}$ %
Metro	377	7.1	14.3	18.3	20.4	30.2	9.5	65.0
Urban	289	6.2	14.1	17.9	19.3	32.1	8.2	66.2
Rural	331	4.5	5.4	21.4	21.1	36.5	10.8	70.3
Totals	997[1]	6.1	11.4	19.2	20.3	32.8	10.2	66.9

[1]158 no responses yield a response rate of 86.4%.

These data, in the aggregate, suggest that foster parents see themselves as major providers of supportive services as well as at least minority partners in financing them.[13]

Services for Foster Child Behavior Problems

In a related manner, we asked foster parents to tell us whether they had or were currently experiencing each of 23

---

[13]Total out-of-pocket costs to foster parents may far exceed our estimates depending on how one calculates costs. Settles, Van Name, and Alley, for example, suggest that employment income lost due to remaining home to care for foster children should be considered in computing indirect costs of care. They conclude that indirect costs may represent 60 percent of total care costs. See: Barbara H. Settles, *et al*, "Estimating Costs in Foster Family Care," Children Today, 5(6), 1976, p. 42.

different behavior problems for each foster child now in their care.

Of interest to this section was the follow-up probe that asked whether they tried to handle each problem they experienced themselves or sought agency or other outside help.

Table 3-19 gives the list of behavioral problems that was applied by foster parents to each foster child and provides the percentage of total incidents experienced that foster parents attempted to resolve themselves.

Table 3-19

Percentage of All Instances of 23 Foster Child Behavior Problems that Foster Parents Attempted to Resolve Themselves

	Type of Child Problem	% of All Instances F.P. Resolved Themselves		Type of Child Problem	% of All Instances F.P. Resolved Themselves
1.	Poor Eating Habits	95.2	12.	Fighting w/other kids	91.7
2.	Poor Personal Cleanliness	97.8	13.	Sassy to Adults	87.8
3.	Sloppy Dress	98.5	14.	Temper Tantrums	88.0
4.	Poor Table Manners	98.1	15.	Constant Crying	90.1
5.	Nail Biting	97.0	16.	Drug Use	74.0
6.	Too quiet or shy	88.1	17.	Alcohol Use	82.6
7.	Day Dreaming	87.8	18.	Tobacco Use	92.9
8.	Bed Wetting/ Soiling	91.7	19.	Dating Habits	84.3
9.	Nightmares	88.1	20.	Shop Lifting	77.7
10.	Masturbation	81.8	21.	Stealing Household Goods	82.4
11.	Lies Often	86.1	22.	Running Away	66.7
			23.	Failing at School	67.1

By way of further illustration of the meaning of these percentages, when foster parents experience a problem with shop lifting (as they do with 6.5 percent of their foster children) they attempt to resolve this problem through their own intercessions with officials, counseling with the child, and so on 77.7 percent of the time.

These data suggest that foster parents see themselves as providing not only substantial supportive services, but also the lion's share of services normally assumed to be carried out by the agency and other helping professions.

The explanation for this high--and perhaps inappropriate--degree of self reliance does not necessarily lie in foster parents not being able to get outside help: Fewer than 5 percent of all foster parents indicated they sought but could not get help for each of the 23 items reported upon.

It is possible, on the other hand, that foster parents simply lack knowledge about and know how in obtaining needed counseling and other services.

A look at the limited nature of foster parent training in the Southeast provides at least partial support for such a conclusion.

Still, it should not be overlooked that foster parents take the parenting role seriously, and may simply consider shouldering these responsibilities as a part of their general duties.

Foster Parent Training

No state in Region IV sponsors comprehensive, uniform orientation and/or in-service training programs for foster parents.

According to our data from the states, only 1 state regularly sponsors a uniform orientation program for new foster parents and applicants and a total of 3 states provide some funding to support in-service training carried out by lower levels of government, as shown in Table 3-20.

Table 3-20

Types of Foster Parent Training Services
by Level of Government
Sponsoring/Conducting

Type of Training Service	State	District	County	Not Provided
Orientation: new/ potential F.P.s	1	2	5	-
Financial Support for Workshop/Conference Attendance	1	1	6	-
Financial Support for In-Service Training	3	1	4	-
Financial Support for Specialized Training	-	1	3	4
Foster Parent Manual	2	-	2	4

These data do not, of course, mean that lower levels of government in fact finance and provide several varieties of training; rather they represent local options to do so.

Data from our 64 county sample appear to indicate that this local option is infrequently exercised, as illustrated in the following breakdowns:

-- 4 of 64 counties provide county funds to enable foster parents to attend workshops, conferences, or specialized training conducted by outside agencies;

-- 15 counties conduct regular orientation programs for applicants and new foster parents, another 14 carry this function out on an infrequent and unstructured basis, and 35 have no orientation program at all; and,

-- 17 counties carry out organized in-service training programs, another 15 irregularly make some kind of effort, and 36 have no such program.

In sum, from an official standpoint, the foster parent role is ill defined, laced with conflicts, and essentially unsupported or undersupported in terms of agency decision

making involvement, fringe benefits, service payments, service supports and training.

From the foster parent standpoint, it would seem that they have responded to multiple ambiguities, conflicts, and perceived support inadequacies by implementing broader and more numerous responsibilities than may be appropriate to or warranted by the role.

In a number of ways the role that foster parents play contributes substantially to the level of adequacy of the foster family home supply in the Southeast.

One need only ask how adequate the supply would be should foster parents narrow their role--or have it narrowed--to make the point.

Who would pick up the cost and service burden that would be created by narrowing the foster parent role?

Summary

Conventional, business as usual, and more of the same are words and phrases that seem to typify the current supply of foster family homes in the Southeast.

Our examination indicates that very little is being done in most states to encourage the development of foster family homes for children with special needs through funding, recruitment, licensing, and/or training mechanisms.

We are left with an impression that counties, at their discretion, may be using some foster homes with standard licenses for special purposes, but if so, the number and the bases for their selection are unknown.

This impression highlights the general observation that counties have wide latitude in carrying out their programs and that their actions have as much--perhaps more--to do with the current nature of foster family care services than state standards and regulations.

In any event, our data show that a large majority of licensed foster family homes fit a conventional family model, that is, a two parent, working husband and housewife model.

States appear to be successful in expanding their overall numbers of foster homes by appealing to this talent pool.

This fact may undercut motivation to experiment with appeals to other potential talent pools such as single parents--both employed and unemployed men and women--childless and/or older couples, and others, even though state policies restricting the eligibility of such groups are fast disappearing.

One argument against altering the composition of the current supply of foster homes is, of course, money.

States presently have very little in the way of financial resources to underwrite the costs inherent in specialized foster family care programs.

Startup costs related to recruitment, training, and home renovation are realities. Ongoing costs of higher board rates, special allowances, and, perhaps, improved foster parent fringe benefits befitting their specialized stature must be added as well.

Another cost consideration supporting the status quo is the bargain states presently enjoy. The current foster family home supply provides a substantial number of free services and, in addition, directly subsidizes foster care through out-of-pocket expenses to a significant extent.

Any state effort to alter the composition of the current supply of foster family homes, or for that matter, to implement new standards clarifying and perhaps restricting the foster parent role, risks increasing costs on both counts.

The "dead hand of the known" is also in evidence in state-local relationships. Increased state leadership relative to changing or upgrading foster family home supply surely would encroach upon traditions, that is local options in running their own programs.

States likely face the prospect of picking up an increasing share of the cost burden with each step they take to convert local options relative to funding, recruitment, training, case evaluation and reporting, and so on, to state requirements.

All of this makes for business as usual and creates an emphasis upon change, if at all, toward a "more of the same" pattern of growth.

Current state foster family care programs throughout the Southeast are readily identifiable as highly conventional and seemingly adequate to serve conventional--or traditional--foster family care needs.

This balance between conventional supply and demand, however, is extremely delicate and requires much effort to maintain.

Such efforts in any event may be fruitless.

Socioeconomic changes in our society such as increased marital breakdown and the rapid movement of women into the work force are now impacting the "new" South.

These changes may well have an effect upon the two parent--working husband and housewife pool currently relied upon, forcing pronounced adaptation within foster family care programs.

Two other factors may prove to be of more direct consequence to the status quo.

First, the unresolved conflicts in and surrounding the foster parent role are fast surfacing and being articulated in the minds of foster parents as well as in related legal actions.

Foster parents are rapidly organizing into a growing social movement of foster parent associations thereby creating the potential for "collective bargaining" to resolve these conflicts as well as to settle other matters related to fringe benefits and needed service supports.

If states do not move rapidly to face these issues and role conflicts, they hazard creating a stimulus for change from within the current foster family home supply itself.

Most importantly, the noise and clamor is rising from sources outside foster family care programs representing changing demands for services.

In the next chapter we will take a look at the nature and types of changing demands in the Southeast in an effort to estimate what would be needed in the way of changing supply to meet them.

CHAPTER IV

SOURCES OF DEMAND FOR FOSTER FAMILY CARE

Foster family care programs in the Southeast may be in the midst of what one observer has recently termed a quiet but growing crisis.[14]

In this sense, it is probably more appropriate to talk about changes in needs rather than in demand for such services.

Changes in need are occurring while programs continue to utilize a business as usual approach. We have not yet reached the critical stage when these needs become converted to obvious and open demands for change.

Data from the 8 states in Region IV indicate that these programs operated 16,232 licensed foster family homes and were serving 31,911 foster children during the conduct of our study.

These data represent an estimate growth rate of 10.4 percent in the number of foster family homes and 10.9 percent in the number of children served over FY '75.[15]

These rates were experienced despite very low levels of change or innovation in program policy, management style, funding levels, licensing procedures, recruitment, training, and other efforts during the year.

In general, states seem to have had little difficulty in successfully recruiting the type of foster family homes upon which they have traditionally relied, namely the 2 parent working husband and housewife household.

---

[14]Frank Ferro, "Improving the Child Welfare System," Children Today, 5(6), 1976.

[15]The growth rate for children served is a projection from placement and release data for 4,523 children served in our 64 county sample. Of all children served in these counties, 43.3 percent were admitted and 31.4 percent discharged in FY '76. Utilizing 31,911 as a base, this leads to estimates for Region IV of 13,817 placements and 10,658 releases, or a net increase of 3,159 children in care during FY '76.

Similarly, the vast majority of children placed appear to be of the type traditionally placed; namely, children with no obvious or pronounced mental, behavioral, or physical disorders capable of rather easy adjustment to an acceptable home like substitute care environment.

Little discernable specialization exists in state programs. No state has clearly established policy and licensing criteria governing specialized foster family homes, although 3 states have experimented in the last year in issuing very limited numbers of specialized licenses, primarily to serve a few emotionally disturbed children.

As a practical matter, the specialized use of foster family homes having standard licenses is left to the discretion of local agencies.

Projecting from our data for 24 counties in 3 states, we estimate a total of 56 such homes serving 63 children in those states.

Nonetheless, some specialization is implicit, particularly in regard to long-term care. Our foster parents sample reports that 38.7 percent of all children have been in care 2 years or longer.

Projecting this figure to the total number of children in care yields an estimate of 12,350 children in long-term foster family care.

At the local level, 21 counties in 4 states report that they enter into formal agreements with foster parents to provide permanent foster care for a total of 70 children.

Two states also indicated that consideration is being given to the implementation of a permanent foster family care program statewide.

This description forms the baseline against which our estimates of unmet and changing needs, that is, potential sources of demand, may be placed.

In this chapter, we will attempt to assess the nature and extent of these potential sources of demand as they exist both outside and within current foster family care programs.

Potential Sources of Demand Outside Current Foster Family Care Programs

In this section we will attempt to identify unmet and changing needs as they relate to the low income family, abused and neglected children, and children with special needs who are institutionalized.

These potential sources of demand were selected for the sense of urgency that surrounds them,[16] not because data are readily available for use in developing accurate estimates.

Indeed, comprehensive data of proven reliability are almost wholly absent. This makes the quantification of unmet and changing needs a hazardous business at best.

Because of this, it should be understood that the estimates presented in this chapter represent a beginning point upon which more definitive evaluations of unmet and changing needs may be built.

The Low Income Family

The low income family, for our purposes, is the family currently receiving public assistance.

One reason for focusing on this class of low income families is that it is the primary target for public child welfare services.

Secondly, these families perhaps most clearly represent the severe problems and stresses experienced within the general body of low income families relative to unemployment, marital breakdown, and the like that are reasoned to negatively impact family capacity for coping with child rearing functions.

---

[16] Child Welfare in 25 States--An Overview. (Children's Bureau, Office of Child Development, DHEW, 1976). Among other observations about foster family care, this survey concluded that there is, "...a serious weakness in the dearth of homes for seriously acting-out children, the multiply handicapped, and others with complex needs." p. 68.

Indeed, the body of AFDC recipients in the Southeast is extremely heavily weighted toward single parent households: only one state (Kentucky) provides AFDC-UP payments as one method for maintaining the husband in the home.

Initially, our thinking was that state Title XX service plans would be a ready source for gathering data on current levels of service provision and projections of unmet needs relative to foster family care for children.

A reading of the Title XX plans for FY '76 and FY '77 for each state proved this thinking to be erroneous.

Only one state (Tennessee) estimated unmet need for foster family care services. According to its plan, 7,304 children--or 38 percent of the total--would need but not get foster family care during FY '76.

Some states entered figures only for numbers of children for whom foster family care would be utilized to prevent institutionalization, and other states provided combined projections for adult and child foster family care making a breakout impossible for children only.

Projections regarding the provision of child protective services were equally difficult to decifer.

An overall picture of foster family care service provision and unmet need simply could not be obtained from Title XX plans.

Data obtained from state foster family care officials in our own survey was equally limited.

No state could provide us even rough estimates of the level of unmet need, or other data that might prove useful in making projections, such as estimates of the total number of foster family care referrals made during FY '76, trends in increases or declines in referral rates from 23 common sources of referrals, distributions of numbers of children by reason for placement, or number of children replaced and distributions of children by type of replacement resource.

Given this state of affairs, we turned to the recently published study of child welfare programs in the U.S. conducted by the General Accounting Office.[17]

The findings of this highly controversial study are based on data collected by the GAO at 10 locations in 6 states for the purpose of estimating the quantity and quality of services provided to children through Title IV A & B (now transferred to Title XX) funded programs.[18]

Based on these data, the GAO estimated that 694,000 children are presently receiving child welfare services, 224,000 (or 32.2 percent) of whom are residing in foster family homes.[19]

Overall, the GAO estimated that of, "...16.2 million children [who] might have needed Title IV supported assistance during FY '74, ...about half were assisted."[20]

This represents an undetected or unmet need rate of about 50 percent.

Most important for our purposes is the GAO estimate of unmet need for children it classifies as in a critical situation, that is, "...children estimated to have been in undetected need of placement outside their homes."[21]

Utilizing 1970 census data as a baseline, the GAO estimates that 2.2 percent of all children in the U.S. fall into this category.

Put another way, roughly 10.4 percent of all children eligible for Title IV (Title XX) services require out-of-home placements. Proportionately, this represents 27 percent of undetected or unmet children's service needs.

---

[17] More Can Be Learned and Done About the Well Being of Children. (Social and Rehabilitation Service, DHEW, April 9, 1976.)

[18] Ibid, p. 8.

[19] Ibid, p. 42.

[20] Ibid, p. 75.

[21] Ibid, p. 14.

According to recent data (December, 1975) 1,220,000 children receive maintenance assistance through the AFDC program in the 8 southeastern states comprising Region IV.[22]

Within this program alone, GAO estimates would suggest unmet service needs for 610,000 children, 10.4 percent of whom, or 63,440 require out-of-home placements.

As previously noted, GAO estimates 32.2 percent of all children receiving child welfare services to be in foster family homes.

Within the current system of placement practices, then, this last percentage would yield an estimated 20,428 children in AFDC families in Region IV in need of but not receiving foster family care.

Responding to this unmet need alone would increase the current Region IV foster family care caseload by 64 percent, all other things being equal.

Abused and Neglected Children

Child abuse and neglect are phenomena that may create a need for removal from the home. Within recent years, there has been an explosion in the number of such reports to official agencies, both nationally and within the Southeast.

This is demonstrated most dramatically in the experience of the state of Florida where the number of such reports sky rocketed in one year from 17 (1970) to 19,120 (1971), following the implementation of a widely publicized state reporting system.[23]

---

[22]"Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Caseload and Payment Trends in Region IV," Social and Rehabilitation Service, DHEW, Region IV Office. Mimeo, no date.

[23]Saad Z. Nagi, Child Maltreatment in the United States. (Columbus, Ohio: Mershan Center, The Ohio State University, 1976), p. 47.

As yet, it is impossible to say whether this volume simply represents better reporting or actual increases in incidence, or what proportion is accounted for by each factor.

Due to differences in definitions of child abuse and neglect in state laws and policies, it is also impossible to determine in any meaningful sense how frequently foster family care is now being utilized to serve abused and neglected children.

For example, Fanshel indicates 19 percent of all children in foster family care in New York City are there as a result of abuse and neglect.[24]

Other jurisdictions report abuse and neglect as the reason for placement variously as accounting for 51 percent (Arizona), 46.3 percent (California), and 13.6 percent (Massachusetts) of all children in foster family care.[25]

In spite of these problems, it is essential that some estimate be made regarding what the rise in child abuse and neglect may mean in the way of unmet and/or changing demand for foster family care services.

Of equal importance, child abuse and neglect are not acts restricted to low income families.

To some extent then, what we have to say about the need for foster family care for abused and neglected children represents unmet need among families not included in our previous estimates for low income families.

Utilizing what he terms a "medium" basis for estimation, Nagi concludes that there are currently 243,626 confirmable cases of child abuse and 2,049,775 confirmable cases of child neglect in the U.S.

---

[24]David Fanshel, "Computerized Information Systems and Foster Care," Children Today, 5(6), 1976, p. 17.

[25]Shirley M. Vasaly, Foster Care in Five States. (Washington, DC: Social Research Group, The George Washington University, 1976), p. 23, Table 8.

These estimates reflect rates of 3.53 per 1,000 children for abuse and 29.7 per 1,000 children for neglect utilizing 1970 Census data as a base for computations.[26]

In his study, Nagi collected data on child maltreatment in sampling jurisdictions spread throughout the country that contained together over 30 percent of the nation's children.

From this data base, Nagi has calculated the current rate of occurrence of child abuse and neglect together to be 8.78 per 1,000 children.

His data also indicate that 27.3 percent of all reported cases are considered abuse (72.7 percent neglect) and that 71.3 percent of reported abuse is confirmed while the confirmation rate for all reported neglect is 69.6 percent.[27]

Applying these rates--both because they are relatively conservative and the best available--to 1970 Census figures for total state populations of children under age 18 in Region IV, we estimate that there are at present within the region 71,384 confirmable cases of child abuse and neglect.

The derived estimates for each state and the region as a whole are shown in Table 4-1.

These data represent the estimated pool of such cases, not those now known to service agencies.

If other reporting statistics are to be believed, then most of these cases are currently undetected.

Available data for the first half of 1976 from the National Study on Child Abuse and Neglect, for example, indicate among reporting states in Region IV that no more than 14 percent of all confirmable cases of abuse in Georgia will be identified when the final tallies are in for the year.

---

[26]Saad Z. Nagi, op cit, p. 51.

[27]Ibid, p. 75.

Table 4-1

Child Abuse and Neglect Estimates
for Region IV, by States

	1970 Population under age 18[1]	CAN Weighted Incidence Rates[2] A/N	Total	Projected rates of Confirmation[3] A/N	Total
Ala.	1,233,520	2,958/ 7,877	10,835	2,109 5,482	7,632
Fla.[4]	2,109,041	7,102/ 22,867	29,969	3,977/ 12,806	16,783
Ga.	1,644,288	3,940/ 10,491	14,434	2,809/ 7,304	10,168
Ky.	1,114,042	2,670/ 7,111	9,781	1,904/ 4,949	6,890
Miss.	843,767	2,022/ 5,386	7,408	1,442/ 3,749	5,21[illegible]
N.C.	1,759,042	4,216/ 11,228	15,444	3,006/ 7,815	10,880
S.C.	955,163	2,289/ 6,097	8,386	1,632/ 4,244	5,908
Tenn.	1,325,727	3,178/ 8,462	11,640	2,266/ 5,890	8,200
Totals	10,984,590	28,376/ 79,521	107,897	19,145/ 52,239	71,384

[1]Source: 1970 Census of Population--U.S. Summary PC(1)-B1, Table 62.
[2]Rate utilized for all states except Florida was 8.78 per 1,000 children.
[3]Confirmation rates utilized for abuse and neglect were 71.3 and 69.6 percent respectively.
[4]Rates utilized for Florida are actual state rates, as follow: 14.21 per 1,000 children and 56 percent confirmation rates for both abuse and neglect. Use of this rate while applying the other set of rates uniformly to 7 states alters over all regional statistics somewhat. For example, the confirmation rate for Region IV for abuse becomes 68.5 percent compared to Nagi's 71.3 percent rate.

Comparable percentages for child abuse and neglect (Georgia reports only abuse) for Mississippi and North Carolina are 8.5 and 7.8 respectively.[28]

Aggregates of data from the National Study also reveal that about 30.9 percent of all reported cases involve families receiving AFDC and/or other public assistance.

Factoring out the AFDC-PA portion of child abuse and neglect cases yields a residual figure of 49,326 (69.1% x 71,384) unduplicated children confirmable as abused and/or neglected.

This number constitutes an estimate of service need beyond present welfare caseloads, of which, according to our data upwards of 90 percent is undetected and unmet.

The most pertinent question remains, how many of these children need foster family care?

We have interpolated percentage estimates provided in Dr. Nagi's study by 129 child protective service agencies in response to a similar question to arrive at our estimate.

Overall, these agencies indicate that removal from the home is the recommended action in 32.6 percent of all confirmed cases of child abuse and neglect.[29]

---

[28]The National Study is being carried out by the American Humane Association in Denver under contract with the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, Office of Child Development, DHEW.

As the designated Child Abuse and Neglect Resource Development Center for Region IV, the Institute receives quarterly printouts on data for states in the Southeast reporting to the National Study.

[29]It is noteworthy here, according to statistics from the National Study for the 2 states in Region IV for which data are available (Mississippi and North Carolina), that 18.7% of confirmed abused and neglected children were placed in foster family care during calendar 1975. This proportion rose to 39.9 percent for the first half of calendar 1976, or a projected placement increase of 142.6 percent.

It is likely that this figure includes a considerable number of children for whom temporary shelter or foster care is recommended, but this in itself would simply reflect a source of demand for altering present foster family care systems to accommodate more short-term children.

In any event, we estimate that 16,080 abused and neglected children in Region IV (32.6% x 49,326) currently need but are not receiving out-of-home placements, in addition to the estimate previously rendered for the AFDC-PA population.

Institutionalized Children with Special Needs

Finally, there is growing pressure upon states to deinstitutionalize children with special needs to the maximum extent possible.

Categories of children most often referred to in this regard include adjudicated delinquents, the mentally retarded, the physically handicapped and the emotionally disturbed.

Again, states could not provide us with usable numbers of children in these categories who are currently institutionalized.

Each of these categories of children is provided for by separate bureaus or departments within the several states and communication and reporting between these components is less than optimum.

Once again, for the most part, we have had to rely on rates and data derived from other national and state studies in forming our projections. These projections are perhaps the least satsifactory--or unreliable--in the study.

Delinquent Children

According to relatively recent data nearly 8,000 children were in public institutions for delinquent children in the 8 states of Region IV in 1970.[30]

---

[30] Statistics on Public Institutions for Delinquent Children, 1970. NCSS, Table 2.

Although some states in Region IV have vigorously pursued deinstitutionalization since 1970--notably Florida, other states indicate their delinquency populations to be increasing.

Generally speaking, the 8,000 figure would seem to be a safe estimate, given these changes.

On a national basis, experts estimate conservatively that at least one-half of all children in such institutions are there for status offenses.[31]

At a minimum, status offenders would seem to be prime candidates for deinstitutionalization. We have no way of knowing how many might usefully be placed in foster family care, but the preferred mode for out-of-home placements for deliquents these days is group home care.

If only status offenders were deinstitutionalized (Regional estimate: 4,000) and 1 in 4 needed individualized out-of-home care, then roughly 1,000 foster family care placements would be needed.

This estimate, if accurate, should be of concern to state foster family care officials, given the movement underway to remove status offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction.

As of July 1, 1976, in Florida, for example, status offenders are no longer delinquents but rather dependents under the law.

This has resulted in an average increase of 300 cases per month in state child protective service caseloads and has placed an as yet undetermined burden upon existing foster family home supplies.[32]

---

[31]William T. Pink and Mervin F. White (eds.), Delinquency Prevention: A Conference Perspective on Issues and Directions (Regional Research Institute, Portland State University, 1973).

[32]Personal communication with Geraldine Fell, Chief, State of Florida Child Protective Services, September, 1976.

Mentally and Physically Handicapped Children

To derive estimates for these categories of children, we have once again utilized the technique of deriving national rates from 1970 census data and have drawn proportional estimates for the Southeast.[33]

This approach yields an estimate of 14,000 handicapped children residing in public institutions within our 8 states (3,200 primarily physically handicapped and 11,800 primarily mentally retarded children).

This number does not include a much larger number of mildly retarded children receiving other types of services,[34] nor does it include physically handicapped children in such congregate care facilities as nursing homes.

In answer to the question of how many of these children could utilize foster family care, we found no better basis for estimation than that provided in Horejsi's study of the placement needs of institutionalized handicapped children in Western Montana.[35]

In that study, an analysis was made of the placement needs and perferred placement mode for each of 527 children comprising the entire institutionalized handicapped child caseload for Western Montana. Of the total, 156 had significant physical handicaps.

---

[33]The data sources, for this computation, in addition to 1970 population figures are found in: Alfred Kadushin, Child Welfare Services 2nd Ed. (N.Y.: Macmillan, 1974), Table 12-1, p. 629; and, Morris F. Mayer, et al, Residential Group Care for Dependent, Neglected and Emotionally Disturbed Children in the U.S. Mimeo, January, 1976, Chap. II.

[34]Robert A. Perkins, Deinstitutionalization Project, final report (Baton Rouge: Division of Mental Retardation, Louisiania Health and Human Resources Administration, May, 1974), pp. 29ff.

[35]Charles R. Horejsi, Deinstitutionalization and the Development of Community Based Services for the Mentally Retarded: An Overview of Concepts and Issues (Missoula, Montana: Department of Social Work, University of Montana, August, 1975).

Based on comprehensive case data, evaluation staff concluded that 80 children (or 15.1%) could function well in relatively ordinary foster homes and an additional 42 (or 7.9%) could do well in foster homes provided with special services and/or accommodations, or an overall total of 23 percent.[36]

Assuming that the characteristics of the institutionalized population of handicapped children in Western Montana approximate those for similar children in the Southeast, Horejsi's figure would yield 3,220 such children (23% X 14,000) capable of functioning in one type of foster family care environment or another.[37]

Consistent with our previous observations, Horejsi concludes that the primary road block to deinstitutionalizing handicapped children is the diffusion of control over such programs through many state departments and bureaus.

Recalling our initial caveats about the quality of the data, we will nonetheless estimate that at least 4,220 children in Region IV could be appropriately deinstitutionalized to foster family care, if such care indeed existed and bureaucratic problems surrounding program control could be eliminated.

In sum, we estimate a total of 40,728 children from all of these potential sources of demand to be in current need of but not receiving some form of foster family care.

This estimate represents the number of children undetected by, or for the most part currently outside or unaffected by state child welfare service programs.

---

[36]Charles R. Horejsi, and Ann B. Berkly, Deinstitutionalization and the Development of Community Based Services for the Mentally Retarded Youth of Western Montana (Missoula, Montana: Department of Social Work, University of Montana, August, 1975), p. 18.

[37]This is probably a conservative percentage estimate inasmuch as staff evaluations indicated an additional 73 children or 13.8 percent of the total might be capable of either foster family home or group (nursing) home living.

The addition of these children to present current foster family care programs in itself would require approximately a 128 percent increase in the provision of foster family services regionwide.

Potential Sources of Demand within Current Foster Family Care Programs

In the opening section of this chapter we have attempted to estimate the extent and sources of undetected or unmet need for foster family care.

This section will examine unmet need--or potential sources of demand--for services within the population of children who have been detected and are being served in foster family homes.

Children Recommended for Foster Family Placement Who Were not Placed

Data from our 64 county sample indicate that 15.1 percent of all agency recommendations for foster family placement did not lead to placements during FY '76.

Projecting this figure to the regionwide caseload yields an estimate of *2,458 non placements* among a total of 16,275 foster family care placement recommendations.

The reasons given by counties for not placing children in need of foster family care are given in Table 4-2, again in the form of regionwide projections.

These figures indicate that about 58 percent of non placements resulted from a lack of regular and specialized foster family homes and 42 percent from organizational or procedural barriers and constraints.

The problem of non placement is most pronounced in metropolitan areas, according to our county data, which represent 72.7 percent of all non placements, as reflected in Table 4-3.

Table 4-2

Projected Regionwide Distribution of Reasons for Not Placing Children in Need of Foster Family Care

Reasons for Non Placement	No. of Children Not Placed	% Not Placed of Total Recommended for Placement
Standard Foster Home not Available	983	6.0
Specialized Foster Home not Available	442	2.7
Agency Lacked Legal Custody	492	3.1
Agency Lacked Staff to Conduct Home Studies to Develop New Homes	541	3.3
Totals	2,458	15.1

Table 4-3

The 64 County Sample Distribution of Non Placements by County Population Size, FY '76

Type of County	No. of Ctys.	No. of Placement Recommendations	No. Not Placed	Non Placement Rate
Metro	9	2440	586	24.0
Urban	16	1497	141	9.4
Rural	39	1391	78	15.6
Totals	64	5328	805	15.1

Further assessment of county data reveals that metropolitan counties are operating their own programs at--or near--maximum capacity and are utilizing out-of-county placements at far lower rates than either urban or rural counties, as shown in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4

The 64 County Sample Distribution of Out-of-County Placement Rates and Maximum Licensed Capacity Levels by County Population Size, FY '76

Type of County	No. of Ctys.	No. of Children in Foster Homes	%Placed Out of: County	State	Licensed Capacity N	Licensed Capacity % Utilized
Metro	9	2075	3.2	.1	2256	91.9
Urban	16	1275	29.0	.1	1466	86.6
Rural	39	1173	27.5	.7	1559	75.2
Totals	64	4523	17.2	.1	5281	85.6

A total of 17.3 percent or 784 of all children in foster family homes are in placement out of the home agency's county.

Counties indicate that 50 percent of all out-of-county placements are made for lack of locally available standard foster family homes.

Another 35 percent are placed out of county to provide children with specialized foster family homes not available locally.

Finally, 7 percent are placed out of county to be nearer natural parents and 8 percent are approved to move with existing foster parents when they relocate.

Projecting these figures regionwide yields estimates of 5,489 children placed out-of-home county. Among this number approximately 4,691--or 85 percent--are in such placements due to local shortages of regular foster family homes (50 percent, or 2,763) or specialized foster family homes (35 percent, or 1,928).

For an estimated 2,458 children recommended for placements but not placed, and for another 4,691 in out-of-home county placements in Region IV, current foster family care programs are not operating adequately.

The problem appears to be a simple lack of standard foster family homes for half of these children and a lack of specialized foster family homes for at least another one-third.

Our analyses also indicate that the non placement problem and foster family ho e shortages are most severe in metropolitan areas.

Children in Foster Family Care Who Need Something Else

The 64 counties in our sample estimate that 42.4 percent of all children now in foster family care need something other than what they are getting.

Interestingly, estimates on this matter are progressively higher as we pass from metro, through urban, to rural counties as shown in Table 4-5.

The distribution of other types of placements needed for these children according to the counties, and regionwide projections are given in Table 4-6.

Of interest in these projections is that 10,283 children now in placement, or 32.2 percent of the regionwide caseload, could be returned to parents and relatives, at least under conditions of optimal agency resources and efforts.

Concentration on returning at least a portion of this total number would obviously reduce pressures on current programs and aid in finding placements for a goodly number of children recommended for but not getting foster family care.

Table 4-5

The 64 County Sample Distribution of Estimates of Foster Children Needing Some Other Type Care, By County Population Size, FY '76

Type of County	No. of Counties	No. Children in Foster Homes	Children in Need of Something Else N	%
Metro	9	2075	649	31.3
Urban	16	1275	490	44.9
Rural	39	1173	604	59.8
Totals	64	4523	1922	42.2

Table 4-6

The 64 County Sample Distribution of Other Types of Placement Needs for Current Foster Children, and Regionwide Projections

Other Types of Placement Need	Number of Current Foster Children Needing: 64 County Sample: N	%	Regionwide Projections: N
Return to Own Home	1384	72.0	9,742
Return to Relative's Home	77	4.0	541
Special Environment for Emotional Problems	269	14.0	1,894
Special Environment for Behavioral Problems	199	10.0	1,353
Total	1992	100.0	13,530[1]

[1]Figure represents estimated 42.4% of total foster family caseload of 31,911 in need of something else.

It would seem fair to say that there is widespread agency recognition that current foster family care programs are not operating adequately in matching children in need with placement resources.

It is also important to consider the needs of 3,247 children now in foster family care--or 10.1 percent of the regionwide caseload--for whom more specialized environments are recommended (including both in and out-of-county placements with such needs).

Many of these children--perhaps most--could profit from placements in specialized foster family homes geared to working with children with emotional and behavioral problems.

The degree to which foster children are demonstrating serious behavior problems is best reflected in foster parent reports to us about their experiences with children now in their care.

Seven (7) of the more serious types of behavior problems and the percentages of children demonstrating them according to foster parent reports for 2,010 foster children are shown in Table 4-7, along with a metro-urban-rural breakdown and regionwide projections.

These data indicate that foster parents in metropolitan areas experience more serious problems among the children in their care than do foster parents in urban and rural areas.

Among the sobering features in these data are the estimated 21.5 percent, or 5,461 children projected regionwide, who are failing at school, and the 5.1 percent, or 1,423 children regionwide who are involved with drugs.

These and other data in Table 4-7 point to the type and rate of incidence of the serious problems being demonstrated by foster children and, implicitly, some of the priority areas for improving specialized services.

Termination of Parental Rights Proceedings

Among children now in foster family care, some obviously could benefit from termination of parental rights proceedings and adoption, as an alternative to remaining indefinitely in foster family homes.

Table 4-7

Percentages of Foster Children Demonstrating Serious Behavioral Problems Per Foster Parent Reports, by County Population Size and Regionwide Projections

Type of Problem	% of Reported Sample with Problem[1]				Projected Regionwide Number of Foster Children with Problem[2]
	Total	Metro	Urban	Rural	
Drug Use	5.6	8.4	4.4	3.7	1423
Alcohol Use	5.4	8.4	3.9	3.7	1372
Dating Habits	20.6	26.3	12.8	22.4	1821
Shoplifting	6.5	8.4	5.9	5.1	1652
Stealing Household Goods	12.4	13.4	15.2	9.1	3150
Running Away	9.6	11.5	8.8	8.3	2438
Failing at School	21.5	24.5	21.1	18.7	5461

[1]Total sample base is 2010 children. Base used was 1600--or total of all school age children for computing percentages for 6 behaviors and 557, or total of all teenagers, for dating habits items.

[2]Total sample base is 31,911. Base used was 25,401--or all school aged children--for 6 behaviors, and 8839--or all teenagers--for dating habits item.

Our county sample data indicate a relatively rapid growth in the number of termination of parental rights petitions being filed in recent years in behalf of foster children.

Indeed, the total reported number for the 64 counties has increased from 48 during FY '73 to 220 for the first 9 months of FY '76. Further, rural counties seem to be proceeding more aggressively in this matter than urban and metropolitan counties, as indicated in Table 4-8.

Table 4-8

Number of Termination of Parental Rights Petitions Completed on Behalf of Foster Children, FY '73-'76, by County Population Size

Year	No. Completed Petitions Total	Metro	Urban	Rural	Rate of Court Denials N	% of Total
No. of Counties	64	9	16	39		
FY '73	48	10	25	7	6	12.5
FY '74	53	16	20	12	5	9.4
FY '75	157	29	66	64	7	4.4
FY '76[1]	220	53	72	95	-	----

[1]First 9 months

Figures for the first 9 months of FY '76 represent completed petitions on 4.8 percent of all children in foster family care in the 64 counties.

We also asked counties to estimate the number of foster children who could benefit from termination of parental rights proceedings in addition to those for whom petitions had been filed.

The total estimate in this category was 211 children (metro=39, urban=72, rural=100), representing an additional 4.6 percent of the present 64 county foster family caseload of 4,523.

A rough estimate for FY '76 then would be that 9.4 percent of all children in care could benefit from such actions.

This percentage projected regionwide would suggest that approximately 3,000 children now in foster family care would benefit from termination of parental rights proceedings.

Adoption does not necessarily follow from termination of parental rights, unfortunately, and this may have important implications for foster family care programs, especially if they move to serve more mentally and physically handicapped children.

A recent survey of 70 adoption agencies in 6 different states (including Alabama, Georgia, and North Carolina) illustrates the point that for handicapped children, foster family care is frequently a long-term proposition even when adoption is being sought.[38]

These agencies reported that they had 7,943 children in custody during 1972, 3,710 of whom--or 46.7 percent--were in foster family care.

A total of 707 children--or 8.9 percent--were classified as seriously handicapped and, of that number 190--or 26.8 percent--were in foster family placements.[39]

Staff evaluations of handicapped children indicated that 68.3 percent were unlikely to ever be adopted, and that the waiting time between initiation of proceedings and successful adoption for handicapped children was 4.9 years.

Indeed, the time between for non handicapped children was a lengthy 2.9 years.[40]

It seems reasonable to conclude from these findings that the upward trend in numbers of termination of parental rights proceedings in Region IV will not lead to any short-term reduction in foster family care for many children effected by these actions.

Rapid movement of many of these children to more appropriate living arrangements, i.e., adoption, would clearly require higher levels of joint action among adoptions and foster family care personnel.

---

[38]Bruce L. Warren, Analysis of Agency Placement of Handicapped Children Volume 1 (Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilante, Michigan, July, 1974).

[39]Ibid, Data were recomputed from Table 3.4, p. 32.

[40]Ibid, Tables 3.22 and 3.23, p. 62.

Summary

Our numerical estimates of unmet need for child foster family care services in Region IV, both outside and within current programs are summarized in Table 4-9.

Utilizing 1970 Census data as a baseline for the number of children under age 18 in the 8 states of Region IV (N=10,984,590), we derive the following rates of detected/ undetected need for foster family care, as follow:

	Number of Children	Rate Per 1,000 Children
detected need[1]	34,369	3.1
undetected need	40,728	3.7
Total need	75,097	6.8

[1]Includes 2,458 recommended/not placed children with 31,911 now in placement.

If these estimates are anywhere close to true levels of unmet need beyond and within current foster family care programs, then a number of stark realities face responsible officials.

For example, if case identification/evaluation operations were to improve by 50 percent, a total of 23,939 children would surface as needing foster family care and/or foster family care different from that presently being provided (50% of 47,877 children including 40,728 undetected children, 2,458 recommended for but not getting foster family care and 4,691 now out of county for lack of local placements).

How well could current foster family care programs cope with this monumental increase in need?

First, the replacement rate from foster family care during FY '76 was 30.9 percent, or 10,020 children, roughly 80 percent of whom returned to their own homes.

Assume that agencies double their efficiency in returning children to their own homes and that those now in care who have been recommended for return home (10,283) are not duplicated in the existing replacement rate.

Table 4-9

Summary of Estimated Unmet Need for Child Foster Family Care Services in Region IV

Sources Outside Current Programs (Undetected Children)		Sources Within Current Programs (Detected Children)		
Type	Estimated Number of Children	Type		Estimated Number of Children
1. Low Income Families (AFDC-PA)	20,428	1. Need Standard Foster Home		4,779
2. Unduplicated Abused & Neglected Children	16,080	# recommended/not placed	2016	
3. Institutionalized Children w/Special Needs	4,220	# out of county/ need in county	2763	
		2. Need Specialized Foster Home		3,689
Total	40,728	# recommended/not placed	442	
		# out of county/ need in county	1928	
		# in standard/need specialized	1319	
		3. Need Termination/ Adoption		3,000
		4. Need to Return Home		10,283
		Totals in need of foster placement:		8,468
		in need other placement:		13,283

Recognizing that these assumptions are of dubious quality, nonetheless, this would result in an additional 5,142 children returned home, creating together about 15,425 placement openings.

Finally, assume that termination/adoption proceedings are doubled to accommodate the estimated one half of all foster children who could benefit from such proceedings but are not receiving them.

This would yield an additional 1,500 replacements, theoretically opening up a total of 16,925 placements for children in need.

Under assumptions of a 50 percent improvement in case identification/evaluation and an equivalent 50 percent improvement in replacing foster children needing other types of care, current foster family care programs would be running a deficit of approximately 7,014 foster home placements regionwide, all other things being equal.

This assumes, of course, that the present supply of foster family homes would accept large numbers of new children who would frequently have more serious problems than those they replace.

As we will see in the concluding chapter, such an assumption is erroneous. More than 50 percent of current foster parents say they will not accept children with serious problems.

On the other side of the coin, it would be extremely conservative to project that at least 50 percent of current foster family homes would have to be converted through licensing, training, renovation and other efforts in addition to the recruitment at current rates of new homes to adequately handle children having unmet needs for temporary shelter, specialized care, and/or permanent foster care.

In sum, a 50 percent improvement upon the efficiency and effectiveness of such current program practices as case identification, evaluation, and appropriate matching of children with placements would likely yield a doubled--perhaps tripled--service deficit in terms of numbers of children identified as in need of foster family care but for whom placements are unavailable.

This observation supports the notion that improved management practices frequently contribute to increasing rather than reducing demand relative to social services.

Immediate program improvements of this magnitude are, of course, highly improbable.

It is far more likely that states will try to continue the "business as usual" practices that have been previously described.

Our best estimates are that these practices result in identification of 45.8 percent of all children needing foster family care. Further, of all children currently known to foster family care agencies, 7.1 percent in need of placements are not getting them, and of the remainder now in placement 60.4 percent are inappropriately placed.[41]

Faced with these estimates--even if somewhat wide of the mark--states would appear to have a choice: either initiate change now to improve foster family care programs, or wait until the quiet crisis of unmet need builds to identified demand and then respond to outside pressures for change.

The choice is between whether money and effort will be spent now or a bit later.

---

[41] Base for computations:
Detected need: 34,369 detected ÷ 75,097 = 45.8%
Needing Placement: 2458 in need ÷ 34,369 detected = 7.1%
Inappropriate placements: 19,293 need something else ÷ 31,911 total in care = 60.4%

CHAPTER V

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN SUPPLY AND DEMAND

According to our data and projected estimates, large numbers of the total of 31,911 children in foster family care are receiving inappropriate services while a larger number of children in need of out-of-home placements is currently undetected.

A recap of our findings tells the story:

- An estimated 32.2 percent of all children in care (n=10,283) could benefit from a return to their own homes now.

- An estimated 9.4 percent of all children in care (n=3,000) could benefit from termination of parental rights/adoptions proceedings.

- An estimated 14.7 percent (n=4,691) of all children in care are placed out-of-home county due to a lack of local standard and/or specialized foster family homes. An undetermined number of these children could benefit from placements closer to their own homes or localities.

- An estimated 38.7 percent of all children in care (n=12,350) have been in care at least 2 years, and 16.7 percent (n=5,329) have been in care over 5 years. An undetermined number of these children could benefit from a sound program of permanent foster family care.

- An estimated 15.1 percent (n=2,458) of all children recommended by agencies for foster family home placements during 1976 were not placed due to the absence of local standard or specialized foster family homes.

- Finally, an additional 40,728 undetected children in the Southeast are estimated to be in need of some form of out-of-home, non-institutional placements.

Major Factors Contributing to the Gap between Supply and Demand

Several limitations and problems in the conduct of foster family care programs have surfaced during the course of this study which we believe account in a large part for the estimated levels of unmet and inappropriately met needs. Some of these difficulties revealed themselves in our data while others were drawn from discussions with program personnel.

For purposes of organized presentation, these problems and limitations as we see them are grouped and discussed under three major headings, as follow:

1. A Lack of Mechanisms for State Leadership;
2. Absence of a Clear Priority in Providing Foster Family Care for Children with Special Needs; and,
3. Confusion Regarding the Foster Parent Role.

1. A Lack of Mechanisms for State Leadership

Structural constraints play an important role in limiting the responsiveness of foster family care programs. All states have a number of separate bureaus or departments legally mandated to meet the out-of-home service needs for various groups of children.

A profusion of state and federal program appropriations is funneled through these separate units of government contributing to their isolation and independence.

As a result, comprehensive program planning and coordination are undercut making the estimation of unmet need for foster family care among populations of institutionalized children particularly difficult.

A resolution of these constraints would require an overhaul of state and federal programs.

Short of this, utilization of state level committees composed of officials representing major children's service programs that would be responsible for sharing up to date

information would be helpful to all in developing priorities and carrying out their own programs.

Within state foster family care programs, some *managerial shortcomings* are apparent that also have an impact on the gap between the supply and demand for services.

In general terms, the state role is largely concentrated upon to the provision of funds and the enforcement of minimum licensing standards that, for the most part, cover the quality of the home environment, not the quality of care provided.

County agencies--or their equivalents in decentralized state systems--have wide discretion in setting quality of care criteria for applicant and licensed home evaluations, in utilizing standard homes for specialized purposes, in developing and implementing recruitment and training programs, and in establishing data collection and reporting systems.

This last matter is of particular interest since we have found that counties collect, aggregate, and have available for ready use far more data on their foster family care programs than is available at the state level.

Based on this observation, it would seem that improvements in statewide program reporting could be had through modest management improvements at the state level.

Similar improvements upon currently primitive management practices in standard setting, evaluation, recruitment, training and other matters would seem possible through self-initiated efforts by state foster family care officials.

A longstanding tradition in the division of labor between counties and states seems to be a primary barrier to such improvements.

Since counties have traditionally assumed substantial program responsibilities, states have not moved to create the resource and management mechanisms to implement truly uniform statewide programs.

Conversely, without such resources and mechanisms, states are extremely limited in their capacities to intervene and standardize county programs.

This cycle creates many blind spots among state and local officials and perhaps explains better than anything else why management practices are commonly based on the comfortable principles of "business as usual" and "more of the same."

In sum, it would seem a number of initiatives could be launched relative to interdepartmental coordination at the state level and in terms of state-local program relationships that could improve present programs prior to or in the absence of major changes in program legislation.

If nothing else, these initiatives should yield a better matching of children currently being served with services now available.

2. Absence of a Clear Priority on Providing Foster Family Care for Children with Special Needs

Improved management practices would not necessarily yield increased capacity for serving children with special needs within existing foster family care programs.

Such improvements would produce better assessments of the number and service needs of such children and reduce the number of inappropriately placed children now in care, thereby technically increasing the number of placement openings.

The near total absence of state provision for specialized foster family care in terms of licensing, funding, recruitment and training virtually assures, however, that little of value could be accomplished for children with special needs by moving them into placements vacated by those who had been inappropriately placed.

In any event, the capacity of current foster family homes to care for children with special needs is open to serious question, and large numbers of existing foster parents are unwilling to accept such children, according to data presented later in this section.

Although there is widespread recognition of the need to serve children with special needs at the level of rhetoric, there is little evidence of clear priority on and commitment to such children in current programs.

This suggests that a commitment is needed to develop a total program for children with special needs from scratch, rather than partial or piecemeal efforts to improve any one phase of existing foster family care programs.

What is needed is the development of licensing standards, funding mechanisms, recruitment, training, and monitoring procedures for establishing and maintaining specialized foster family homes, and the further application of such a program to the specification of emergency, temporary (pending own home rehabilitation), and permanent types of care within the overall program.

It is doubtful that a lesser commitment would be adequate to closing the gap between supply and demand for children with special needs.

3. Confusion Regarding the Foster Parent Role

Sooner or later, efforts to improve management practices and to create specialized services will confront the need to resolve a number of serious issues surrounding the role of the foster parent.

To some extent better role definitions will follow from improved management practices and specifications in specialized foster family care programs.

Other issues override these matters and will require general resolution through new policy.

One such issue is that of the rights and responsibilities of foster parents relative to the supervision, control and discipline of foster children. What limits are to be imposed on foster parents and what are the legal liabilities attached to these limits. How, in turn, do these limits effect the provision of foster parent services.

Another has to do with the foster parent's set of relationships with natural parents and the sponsoring agency. Foster family care programs must spell out who will work with natural parents and to what extent foster parents will be considered vendors or agency staff members. The foster parent's role in case planning and his rights to fringe benefits among other things are at stake here.

Finally, what is the appropriate scope of foster parent functions? Our data suggest that foster parents currently see themselves as providing over 50 percent of all supportive services, 70-90 percent of all counseling services depending on the nature of a foster child's behavioral problem, and as subsidizing over 30 percent of the total cost of care out of pocket.

Should these functions be more narrowly defined, and if so, who or what will pick up the slack?

In the broadest sense, refinements in the definition of the foster parent's role are essential to establishing the upper limits of capacity within foster family care programs for meeting demand for out-of-home placements, and, in turn, for identifying priorities for program alteration.

What State and Local Officials Think Needs to be Done to Bridge the Gap

State and local foster family care officials have a somewhat different view of the issues involved in maintaining current programs and adapting to changing demands.

We asked foster family care officials in the 8 states and county directors--or their designated representatives--in each of our 64 counties to rate 35 separate factors on a scale from 1 to 5 according to their influence on program quantity, quality, and adaptability, and to add and rate their own items if they wished.

Factors were selected for their relevance to existing programs, not idealized programs. For example, additional personnel would no doubt be a highly ranked factor by most program officials, but such a factor relates to a seldom achieved state whereas existing programs nearly always face the task of achieving satisfactory levels of quantity, quality and adaptability within a condition of personnel shortages.

Ratings for each factor were then averaged to allow rank order presentations.

We found ratings for state and local officials to be nearly identical; therefore, the findings were pooled for the 8 states and 59 county officials who responded.

The rated factors fall into three groups; namely, Staff Development Factors (n=9), Foster Home Supports (n=12), and Operational Policies/Procedures (n=12).[42]

The factors and their identifying numbers are presented in a key following Table 5-1 which gives the ten factors (ranked downward from most influential) that state and county officials believe to have greatest impact on program quantity, quality, and adaptability.

Factors Influencing Quantity and Quality

According to these data, program officials see the maintenance sufficient numbers of foster family homes to depend most heavily on the provision of adequate board rates and clothing allowances, staff capacity for conducting home evaluations and foster parent training in agency policies and procedures (top 5 ranks).

Secondarily (next 5 ranks), quantity is viewed as being influenced by the existence/absence of other types of staff training, licensing standards, existence/absence of service fees, and level of public recognition of the foster parent's role.

Program officials view quality of care to be dependent primarily upon training for foster parents in agency policies and practices and for staff in a number of areas (top 5 ranks).

Secondarily, quality of care is viewed as influenced by such factors as service fees, special board rates, foster parent training in caring for special need children and their greater utilization in recruitment/training, and the existence/absence of a comprehensive foster parent manual.

In general, state and local program officials view adequate training and payment levels as the keys to maintaining program quantity and quality.

---

[42]Two factors received no ratings and were dropped from the list. A total of 7 new factors was added by 11 different raters but none received more than 3 ratings; therefore, none of these factors was utilized in computing our table of factors.

Table 5-1

Rank Order Presentation of Factors Having Greatest Impact on Program Quantity, Quality, and Adaptability, According to State and County Foster Family Care Officials (N=67)

Rank (from most impact downward)	Factors Having Most Impact Upon: Quantity of Homes	Quality of Care	Program Adaptability to Changing Need
1	FH-C1	FH-P2	FH-C1
2	FH-P2	SD- 4	FH-P2
3	SD- 1	SD- 3	FH-P3
4	FH-C2	SD- 1	SD- 3
Top 5	FH-C3	SD- 5	FH-C4
6	SD- 3	FH-C4	FH-C6
7	SD- 2	OP-10	FH-C3
8	OP- 1	FH-P3	SD- 2
9	FH-C6	FH-C6	SD- 1
Top 10	FH-P5	SD- 8	SD- 4

Key: Item Number & Content

Staff Development Factors

SD- 1 Training in Home Evaluations
SD- 2 Training in Foster Home Placement
SD- 3 Training in F.H. Service/Maintenance
SD- 4 Training in Work w/Nat'l Par.
SD- 5 Training in Case Management
SD- 6 F. Par. Role as Agency Team Member (Case Planning)
SD- 7 F.P. Role in Policy Making
SD- 8 F.P. Role in Recruitment/Training
SD- 9 Use of Volunteers

Foster Home Supports

Foster Parents

FH-P1 Payments to meet Licensing Requirements (Home Renovation)
FH-P2 F.P. Training in F.C. Services (Policies/ Practices)
FH-P3 F.P. Training in Caring for Special Needs Child
FH-P4 Staff Fringe Benefits for F.P.
FH-P5 Pub. Recognition of F.P. Role/ Contribution
FH-P6 F.P. Attendance at Workshops/ Conferences

Child Payments

FH-C1 Regular Board Rate
FH-C2 Initial Clothing Allowance
FH-C3 Reg. Clothing Allowance
FH-C4 Special Board Rate
FH-C5 Children's Allowances

Operational Procedures/ Policies

OP- 1 Licensing Standards
OP- 2 Licensing Procedures
OP- 3 Specialized Licenses (for special needs child)
OP- 4 Permanent Foster Care
OP- 5 Foster Parent Adoptions
OP- 6 Termination of Par. Rights/Custody Laws
OP- 7 Accessibility to Home Education/Other Reports
OP- 8 Computerized Data Gathering, Monitoring, Reporting System
OP- 9 Foster Care Review Committee or Judicial Review
OP-10 Comprehensive Foster Parent Manual
OP-11 Coordination w/Other Depts.-Agencies
OP-12 Foster Parent Associations

Factors Influencing Program Adaptability to Changing Demand

Maintaining responsiveness to changing demand for foster family care services is seen as being heavily dependent upon such factors as adequate regular and special board rates, the provision of training to foster parents in agency policy/procedures and methods of caring for children with special needs, and staff training in services to upgrade and maintain foster homes (top 5 ranks).

Secondarily, program adaptability is viewed as depending upon the provision of service fees, clothing allowances, and a variety of staff development training programs.

The most important patterns in these data, in our view, are the high reliance among state and local officials upon payment and training mechanisms to assure program quantity, quality and adaptability, and their near total lack of recognition of the impact of operational policies and procedures upon such matters.

In short, these appear to be rather conventional views on how to bridge the gap between supply and demand, and they illustrate in some ways the managerial blind spots among program officials to which we earlier referred.

Program Options: Issues Pertinent to Modification and Expansion

If we assume that a "business as usual" approach coupled with "more of the same" expansion will not bring current programs as we have described them in line with our estimates of unmet need, then two major options present themselves, namely, modification or expansion in the direction of specialization.

These are not, of course, mutually exclusive options, but their merits are best assessed individually.

The Modifiability of Current Programs

It is perhaps best to consider this option first since assessing it will provide important estimates of how much expansion might be required to achieve the desired goal of

reducing unmet need beyond what might be achievable by program modification.

The basic question here is whether and to what extent the current supply of foster family homes can be diverted and changed to serve children with special needs.

To begin, we asked foster parents in our sample to tell us whether they had already made known their willingness to accept, would be willing to accept under certain conditions, or would be unwilling to accept under any condition, children having 10 different types of special needs.

Table 5-2 provides the breakdown of foster parents' responses to this question.

These data indicate that most foster parents are willing to provide emergency, preadoptive, and/or permanent foster family care, and to accept infants and sibling groups.

They also show, however, that their willingness to do so may be largely restricted to caring for essentially non-problematic children.

For example, although 41.1 percent said they are willing now to accept teenagers, only 22.1 percent said they would accept delinquents.

A further breakdown of these data reveals that a total of 574 separate foster family homes--or 49.6% of our total of 1,155--is receptive to accepting one or more types of children with the most severe problems, namely, delinquency, mental retardation, physical handicap, and emotional disturbance, as shown in Table 5-3.

From this table it is relatively clear that less than 25 percent of all willing foster parents express a preference for a particular type of child and within that figure, only 11 homes indicate a preference for specializing solely in the care of delinquent children.

The comparatively high level of receptivity to caring for physically handicapped children is also of interest since this group of children probably represents the smallest proportion of actual unmet need among the 4 types of children in the table and would likely require the highest out-of-pocket costs for home renovation under present foster family program payment restrictions.

Table 5-2

Willingness of Current Foster Parents to Accept Children with 10 Different Special Needs

Special Need by Type/Group	Willing to Accept Now N	(%)	Willing to Accept w/ Conditions N	(%)	Not Willing to Accept N	(%)	Total Responses[1]
Sibling Groups	634	(71.3)	124	(13.9)	131	(14.7)	889
Infants	547	(61.7)	91	(10.3)	246	(27.7)	881
Teenagers	350	(41.1)	96	(11.2)	404	(47.5)	850
Temp/Emergency Care	651	(79.2)	140	(15.6)	105	(11.7)	896
Child Awaiting Adoption	685	(75.0)	118	(12.9)	110	(12.0)	913
Permanent Foster Care	670	(75.1)	105	(11.7)	117	(13.1)	892
Mentally Retarded	195	(22.1)	157	(17.8)	528	(63.0)	880
Physically Handicapped	203	(23.4)	278	(32.1)	385	(44.4)	866
Emotionally Disturbed	338	(38.6)	197	(22.5)	109	(38.7)	874
Delinquents	184	(21.1)	134	(15.8)	529	(62.4)	847

[1]Represents total recorded responses. Blanks were not utilized in these tabulations.

Table 5-3

Distribution of Current Foster Parents Willing to Accept 4 Types of Children with Special Needs Now, or Under Improved Conditions

Type of Child	Total Responses[1]	Willing to Accept Now, or w/Conditions		Number of Homes Willing to Accept Now, or w/Conditions:					
				Homes		1 Type Only		2 or More Types	
		N	(% of Tot.)	N	(% of Tot.)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Delinquent	847	313	(36.9)	105	(18.2)	11	(10.4)	94	(89.6)
M. Retarded	880	351	(39.9)	114	(19.8)	26	(23.0)	88	(77.0)
P. Handicapped	866	481	(55.5)	211	(36.8)	57	(27.0)	154	(73.0)
Emot. Disturbed	874	534	(61.1)	144	(25.2)	39	(27.2)	105	(72.8)
				574		133	(23.1)	441	(76.9)

[1]Represents total recorded responses. Blanks were not utilized in these tabulations.

These patterns in the data suggest that while an impressive number of foster parents may be willing to undertake the demanding tasks of caring for at least some types of children with special needs, they may not be well versed in what to expect or what will be expected of them.

Perhaps our most reliable insights on this matter are obtainable from further data provided by that more wary group of 262 foster homes that indicated willingness to accept under improved training and supportive services conditions.

This group represented 45.6 percent of all willing foster parents, evenly spread geographically (metro=100, urban=85, rural=77), and contained a total of 61 homes--or 23.2 percent of the total--expressing preference for 1 type of child only.

Data on preparatory training requirements as expressed by this group are presented in Table 5-4.

Of particular note is the common emphasis upon the following topics regardless of type of child:

- Normal Child Development
- Methods of Discipline/Supervision
- Emotional Problems
- Foster Parents Legal Rights/Responsibilities
- Foster Parent and Child Relationship with Natural Parent(s).

It is also of interest that far higher percentages of foster parents indicate broad needs for training to cope with emotionally disturbed and delinquent children than is the case for mentally retarded and physically handicapped children.

This may well reflect greater past experience with children having emotional and behavioral problems than with children having mental and/or physical handicaps.

If so, the levels of need for training to cope with these latter types of children may be grossly underestimated.

Similarly, Table 5-5 reports expressed supportive service needs for this group of potentially willing foster parents.

Table 5-4

Types of Training Required by Foster Parents as a Condition to Accepting Children with Special Needs, by Rank, Percent Requiring, and Type of Child
(Top 5 Ranks Heavily Bordered)

Training Topics	Delinquents Rank	Delinquents (% of Homes)	Mentally Retarded Rank	Mentally Retarded (% of Homes)	Physically Handicapped Rank	Physically Handicapped (% of Homes)	Emotionally Retarded Rank	Emotionally Retarded (% of Homes)
Normal Child Development	5	(67)	2	(77)	2	(53)	3	(82)
Methods of Discipline/Supervision	1	(100)	1	(86)	3	(52)	2	(98)
Child Nutrition & Health	13	(26)	13	(28	10	(28)	13	(28)
Personal Grooming	14	(25)	14	(23	13	(18)	14	(20)
Emotional Problems	3	(93)	3	(75)	1	(59)	1	(100)
Sexual Behavior & Dating	7	(62)	6*	(44)	11	(24)	7	(53)
Foster Parent & Child Relationship w/Natural Parent	6	(65)	5	(47)	5	(39)	5	(68)
Foster Child Relationship w/Your Own Children	8	(53)	11	(31)	7	(32)	6	(52)
Foster Parents Legal Rights/Responsibilities	2	(98)	4	(62)	4	(51)	4	(74)
Board Rates & Other Budget Problems	10	(45)	9	(37)	8	(31)	10	(42)
Foster Parent Relationship w/Agency	9	(47)	12	(24)	12	(23)	12	(31)
Custody/Guardianship Proceedings	12	(42)	10	(32)	14	(01)	11	(37)
Other Agency & Community Services	11	(44)	8	(38)	9	(30)	9	(47)
State Laws & Agency Policy	4	(77)	6*	(44)	6	(33)	8	(51)
Number of Homes	48		52		96		66	

*Tie Ranks

Table 5-5

Types of Supportive Services Required by Foster Parents as a Condition to Accepting Children with Special Needs, by Rank, Percent Requiring, and Type of Child
(Top 5 Ranks Heavily Bordered)

Needed Agency/ Community Services	Delinquents		Mentally Retarded		Physically Handicapped		Emotionally Disturbed	
	Rank	(% of Homes)	Rank	(% of Homes)	Rank	(% of Homes)	Rank	(% of Homes)
Medical Services	4	(74)	2	(83)	2	(74)	5	(81)
Dental Services	5	(73)	8	(55)	6	(48)	7	(66)
Psychiatric Services	1	(93)	6	(64)	8	(39)	1	(100)
Psychological Testing	3	(84)	3	(73)	9	(37)	2	(98)
Casework Counseling	2	(88)	4	(68)	7	(46)	4	(83)
Physical Therapy	11	(16)	11	(29)	1	(79)	11	(19)
Relief Foster Parents & Babysitting Sers.	7	(61)	5	(66)	4	(53)	6	(70)
Legal Services	9	(56)	10	(31)	11	(22)	10	(31)
Recreational Facilities	8	(60)	7	(57)	5	(51)	8	(59)
Special Education & Tutoring	6	(70)	1	(99)	3	(61)	3	(96)
Foster Parent Association Services	10	(50)	9	(41)	10	(29)	9	(41)
Number of Homes	48		52		96		66	

Aside from the commonly expressed need for better medical services, there is greater differentiation by type of child to be served in terms of requests for supportive services.

A variety of better counseling and testing services is needed for all but the physically handicapped child according to these foster parents, while special education and tutoring receives high emphasis for all except delinquent children.

Also, the need for physical therapy and recreational facilities for physically handicapped children is stressed.

Perhaps of most importance, high priority is placed upon relief foster parent and babysitting services for foster parents caring for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped.

These data provide at least a modest basis for estimating the modifiability of the current supply of foster family homes in the Southeast.

Our sample data indicate that a substantial proportion of current homes--49.6 percent--have an interest in providing some form of specialized foster family care under a variety of circumstances (emergency, preadoptive, or permanent).

Other data reflecting lack of precision in foster parent preferences and the types of training and service supports needed to convert willingness to reality suggest, however, that the true capacity for modification lies substantially below the demonstrated level of interest.

In any event, modification of the current foster family home supply must start with tapping the reservoir of interest among foster parents in changing their services, but it does not end there.

New procedures are required governing the licensing and monitoring of specialized foster family homes, and additional or higher levels of training and supportive services of the types identified, must be delivered.

For purposes to developing a beginning estimate of the overall modifiability of the current foster family home supply in the Southeast, let us assume that the level of

willingness and its distribution in our sample, as shown in Table 5-3, is reflective of the level and distribution for the entire supply of 16,232 foster homes.

These assumptions would yield an estimate of 8,052 current foster homes having at least some interest in providing some form of specialized foster family care.

Let us further estimate that 50 percent of those willing homes--or 4,026 homes--are capable of providing specialized services under optimal procedural, training and supportive service conditions.

Following these assumptions our regionwide projections of the modifiability of the current foster family home supply would be as shown in Table 5-6.

Table 5-6

Regionwide Projections of the Modifiability of the Current Foster Family Home Supply Under Optimum Conditions and a 50 Percent Successful Conversion Rate, by Type of Specialized Home

Homes Specialized To Serve:	No. of Homes Willing	50% Conversion Rate	Number of Homes Willing to Serve: 1 Type Only	2 or More Types
Delinquents	1466	733	76	657
M. Retarded	1594	797	183	614
Phys. Handi.	2962	1481	399	1082
Emot. Dist.	2030	1015	275	740
	8052	4026	933	3093

If these projections--or reasoned guesses--are anywhere close to being accurate, then modification would make a substantial contribution toward meeting the needs of an estimated 4,220 undetected institutionalized children, and a somewhat lesser contribution towards meeting the needs of an estimated 3,687 primarily emotionally or behaviorally disturbed children known by agencies to need specialized foster family care (cf. Table 4-9).

Overall, program modification might meet the needs of about half of the estimated number of children in Region IV in need of specialized foster family care placement.

Program Expansion

It seems reasonable to conclude that modification of the current foster family home supply would not in itself be a satisfactory response to the estimated numbers of detected and undetected children in need of out-of-home placements in the Southeast.

A thoroughgoing modification of current programs might yield a 50 percent reduction in unmet need for specialized foster family care.

This would represent perhaps a 10 to 20 percent reduction in overall detected and undetected need for foster family home placements of all types according to our estimates.

Moreover, since homes converted to specialized services through this approach will be drawn from the current number licensed, it is likely that recruitment efforts would have to be doubled to maintain the current supply of standard foster family homes.

Such an effort would seem necessary for two reasons:

First, increasing the capacity in current foster family care programs for serving children with special needs will result in filling many of these homes with previously undetected children, thereby reducing the number of standard foster homes through conversion without a proportional reduction in children needing them.

Secondly, an unknown but perhaps substantial number of undetected children need, relatively speaking, non-specialized foster home placements. Our projection of a 25 percent reduction in standard foster homes by conversion to specialized care would severely restrict the capacity of current programs relative to meeting any increase in demand for such placements.

Efforts to establish how much expansion is necessary to meet unmet needs, therefore, must take into account the impact of modification on current programs as well as its potential contribution.

The need for maintenance of current programs cannot be overlooked in the drive to modify and expand toward specialization.

Given that current programs contain little or no provision for specialized care, expansion to achieve specialization means the creation of wholly new program components.

Program expansion is more costly than program modification due to startup costs relative to recruitment of new homes, which will probably require the addition of staff as well.

For this reason, among others, it would seem reasonable to proceed with program modification first.

Much that must be done to expand programs must also be done to modify them, including the development of specialized licensing, improved training and supportive services, and the like.

Results from these program efforts will provide reasonable bases for developing cost estimates that would occur in enlarging them to meet expansion needs, as well as a baseline upon which costs unique to expansion, such as recruitment, can be added.

Logic also suggests that it would be wise to determine what is available in the present supply of foster family homes before adding to it.

In any event, perhaps 4 or 5 times as many foster family homes overall, and twice as many specialized homes would have to be added by expansion beyond what can be

expected from current recruitment and projected modification to fully meet our estimates of detected and undetected needs in Region IV.

Summary: A Phased Effort to Close the Gap Between Supply and Demand

It is customary to close a study of this sort with a list of recommended changes.

Rather than do that, we feel it is more appropriate to recap what we think we have learned in the form of a phased effort or design that moves from improvements to current programs, through program modification, to program expansion.

Within each phase a number of possible actions are listed and discussed.

These are the major actions that we think would have to be considered in reaching decisions on program improvements, modifications, and/or expansion.

Phase I: Improvements in Current Programs
(Refining Existing Resources, Existing Purposes)

The logical beginning point in realigning the supply of foster family homes is the improvement of current program components; that is, refining what exists before moving on to the issue of specialization.

In this regard, a considerable number of problems and limitations has surfaced throughout this study which we have reformulated into a set of possible actions.

Decisions on the time sequencing of any of these actions would seem to be best left to responsible officials who must fit them to their own circumstances.

- Establish or improve interdepartmental mechanisms for sharing information on children's services at the state level to enable better estimates of overall need for out-of-home placements.

- Increase statewide program uniformity by tightening state-local agency management relationships through:

  - Expanding current state licensing standards to cover quality of care in addition to minimum standards governing quality of home environment;

  - Modify current reporting forms/procedures to capture at the state level data already collected and aggregated at the local level, especially data on license applications-withdrawals-revocations, and referral and placement sources and rates--including nonplacements, out-of-county placements, parental rights terminations, and the like to improve tracking of child flow and supply/demand fluctuations;

  - Establish or improve state quality control review of a panel of cases or homes for purposes of monitoring/evaluating services;

  - Establish a clear and concrete role for the state in recruitment activities;

  - Set state standards for foster parent and foster family care worker training and seek more state cost sharing in training activities, particularly in reference to orientation for new foster parents and follow-up in-service training. A role for foster parents and foster parent associations should be set forth in such standards.

- Seek at least a 30 percent increase in regular board rates to absorb current levels of out-of-pocket subsidization by foster parents.

- Establish a mechanism (e.g., a state-local committee) empowered to determine why foster parents are providing the lion's share of counseling and allied services themselves, and to recommend improvements in foster parent access to and use of available agency and other professional services.

- Place a priority on the utilization of existing staff to work with natural parents to effect the swift replacement of the large number of foster children determined capable of returning home.

- Define the role of the foster parent, in particular relative to legal rights/responsibilities, case planning and other decision making relationships with the agency and natural parents, and the rightful degree of emphasis in the role upon substitute parenting, simple care taking, and quasi-professional counseling.

- Incorporate more precise role definitions, information on relevant state law, agency policy and program provisions, and material on available community services, training programs and the like in a comprehensive foster parent manual to be individually distributed.

These actions would do little to ease the shortage of specialized foster family homes, but it seems prudent to support refinements in current programs before moving ahead.

Phase II: Modification of Current Programs
(Existing Resources, New Purposes)

Successful program modification toward specialization depends in large part upon accomplishment of a number of refinements in existing programs.

If that base is not laid, officials responsible for program modification will find themselves mired in the business of seeking such refinements and loosing sight of the goals of program modification in the process.

For example, a clear general definition of the foster parent role would seem to be a prerequisite to establishing specialized role criteria.

Similarly, the initial and ongoing identification of volunteers among current foster parents willing to provide specialized care can be a time consuming and costly enterprise in the absence of a decent state office-local agency communication and reporting system.

If, on the other hand, existing programs are at a sufficient stage of refinement to allow concentration on program modification requirements, then some--perhaps all--of the following actions will need to be taken to assure success.

- Intensification of recruitment efforts to prevent creating deficits in current programs that otherwise might result from drawing foster parents from them to provide specialized care. Among the options worth considering in this venture are:

  . Recruitment of qualified people who are currently under utilized such as single women, single men, working couples, minorities, and those willing to accept interracial placements.

  . Formalization of an active role for foster parent associations in the recruitment process.

- Development of a comprehensive set of standards governing the issue of specialized licenses. This set of operational prescriptions should cover at least the following:

  . Standards covering the *quality of the home environment* required by children with special needs, in particular those with emotional/behavioral problems, and those with mental/physical handicaps. These standards should mandate necessary home renovations and special health and safety procedures.

  . Standards covering *the quality of care* that would assure a child's rights to privacy, access to natural family, and protection from foster parent abuse and neglect under the law.

  . Standards for *assessing suitability of foster parent applicants* that would require indepth interview and other evaluations of applicant commitment to, knowledge about, experience in, and time available for caring for children with special needs.

  . Standards *outlining the purpose, components and limits of several forms of care* including emergency, temporary (during natural home rehabilitation), pre-adoptive, and permanent care.

  . Standards and procedures to *regulate the discretionary use of standard foster family homes for special purposes* by local agencies.

- Utilization of an interdepartmental committee of state officials responsible for children's services for the purpose of achieving understandings and agreements leading to uniform acceptance of standards for specialized foster family care.

- Establishment of specialized board rates and service fees applicable to the specialized licensing structure that would be additional to the absorption of current out-of-pocket foster parent subsidization. Among the more pressing specialized needs requiring consideration are:

  . Provision of funds for *home renovations* required by otherwise qualified licensed foster parents and applicants to meet home environment standards for specialized care.

  . Provision of service fees to enable foster parents to purchase at least *minimum insurance protection* as it relates to their liability for children with special needs while in their care.

- Development of comprehensive training programs and standards for both foster family care workers and foster parents involved in specialized care coupled with increased state cost sharing for the conduct of such programs at the local level. A comprehensive program would include at least the following:

  . Group orientation in specialized care for applicants.

  . Introductory training for new foster parents with specialized licenses.

  . Organized in-service training held jointly for workers and foster parents with provision for the involvement of both groups in the development and conduct of content.

  . Funding support to cover expenses for attendance at pertinent workshops and out-of-agency training courses, including high school/college course tuition.

- Creation of a program of relief foster parents and babysitters for foster parents providing specialized care. Such a program could and should draw upon foster parent associations in terms of initial design and subsequent management.

- Establishment of a mechanism, perhaps a joint committee of program officials and foster parent association representatives, to examine issues surrounding fringe benefits for foster parents and to make recommendations regarding the need for benefits pertinent to and fitting the needs and status of foster parents providing specialized care.

Non-obvious Costs in Program Modification

There are many obvious cost factors in this list of program modification actions, such as those related to board rates, service fees, training and recruitment programs, and new program supports like relief and babysitting services.

Other costs are reflected in the increased level of effort required to develop program standards, training materials, and to establish an improved reporting and monitoring infra-structure that may well require additional staff.

Some costs are less obvious, however, and deserve a final word.

First, the impact of modifying present programs must be calculated in terms of costs to the existing program that will continue to operate. One such cost already mentioned is that related to intensifying recruitment efforts.

Secondly, foster home turnover is more costly in a specialized care program. More is invested in recruiting, screening, and training specialized foster parents; therefore, more is lost when they leave the program. Agencies will either experience higher costs for this reason if turnover rates continue at the present pace, or higher management costs to maintain specialized homes to effect reductions in turnover rates.

Finally, agencies might anticipate increased demands for the provision of a number of fringe benefits from specialized foster parents as the program develops. It is quite likely that over time foster parents providing specialized services will develop a higher status level as specialists and, in that process, come to identify and request benefits befitting that status.

Useful cost estimates for program modification cannot be developed in a study such as this since costs vary across states in the Southeast and states will likely take different actions in different time sequences in undertaking their own modification efforts.

The best that can be done here is to identify some of the major obvious and non-obvious cost factors that will be confronted and to reassert that whatever the cost, program modification will at best only partially close the gap between supply and demand.

Over selling the potential in program modification eventually makes supporters into critics and could easily damage prospects for program expansion.

Phase III: Program Expansion
(New Resources, New Purposes)

We have estimated that improvements to present programs and program modification towards specialization would reduce the overall gap between supply and demand by 10 to 20 percent and the gap relative to specialized services by perhaps 50 percent.

Achievements of this magnitude would be impressive in and of themselves, but they also illustrate that a considerable effort in terms of program expansion would be required to further narrow the gap.

Most program expansion actions would be similar to and logically built upon those taken to achieve program modification, hence there is no need here to identify actions that might be considered.

The costs of such actions, however, would likely be greater in many cases simply because program expansion requires new resources.

As pointed out earlier, one of the advantages of following an improvements--modification--expansion process is that it will yield much clearer cost estimates relative to expansion efforts.

Some of the costs of program modification are subsidized by virtue of the fact that it builds upon and draws from existing program resources.

Similarly, the additional startup costs pertinent to program modification represent a major share of the developmental costs normally associated with program expansion.

Thus, program expansion efforts can begin where they should, namely, with immediate increases in standard and specialized foster family care services rather than with costly developmental activities.

This approach provides greater assurance that support obtained to expand programs will not be diverted, as it often is, to shoring up or modifying existing programs.

The assurance that most new resources will go to direct services rather than development increases the prospects of an immediate and obvious payoff from program expansion.

These are major advantages since new program efforts frequently fail to produce dramatic enough results to convince critics that the investment was worthwhile.

In sum, the following are advantages to program expansion when it is the last option to be exercised:

- More precise cost specifications for expansion based upon known costs in current programs.
- Lower risks that expansion program resources will result in a duplication of existing services or be diverted to improve or modify existing programs.
- Reduced startup and developmental costs.
- Increased prospects for immediate impact and public support.

Generally speaking, the best prospects for closing the gap between supply and demand for foster family care services in the Southeast would seem to rest in resolving the problems and limitations identified in this study through a deliberately phased course of actions.

APPENDIX A

SOUTHEASTERN FOSTER FAMILY CARE SURVEY

COUNTY FOSTER FAMILY CARE PROGRAM

QUESTIONNAIRE

Conducted by

The Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research
in cooperation with your
State Foster Family Care Program
with funding provided by
The Social and Rehabilitation Service, DHEW
Grant # SRS 09-P-56015/4-07

Replies and inquiries should be directed to:

Mr. Robert Bransford, Project Coordinator
Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research
Box 152
Athens, Georgia 30601
(404) 542-7614

CHILDREN IN FOSTER FAMILY CARE

(1.) What is the total number of foster family homes licensed/approved by your agency as of July 1, 1975?_____

(1a.) If special licenses/approvals are granted, please indicate the number of foster family homes available at the above mentioned date for each of the categories below. If you have no data on the number of such homes, please check each appropriate box to indicate which types of homes are licensed/approved by your agency.

TYPES OF HOMES	TOTAL	SINGLE PARENT HOMES	RACE: BLACK	WHITE	OTHER
REGULAR FOSTER FAMILY HOMES					
A. LONG TERM					
B. SHORT TERM					
EMERGENCY SHELTER CARE					
PRE-ADOPTIVE					
OTHER (SPECIFY)					

(1b.) Please indicate the source of data used to complete this item._____

_____. Year of Data?_____

(1c.) Is this data source available for further use in the foster family care research project?
( ) No
( ) Yes, from_____

(1d.) If you have no data on this item, please indicate where data might be obtained.

136

137

(2.) Again, as of July 1, 1975, what was the aggregate legal maximum capacity (number of possible placements) for licensed/approved homes?_____.

(2a.) If special licenses/approvals are granted, please indicate the aggregate legal maximum capacity for each category listed below.

TYPES OF HOMES	TOTAL	SINGLE PARENT HOMES	RACE: BLACK	RACE: WHITE	RACE: OTHER
REGULAR FOSTER FAMILY HOMES					
A. LONG TERM					
B. SHORT TERM					
EMERGENCY SHELTER CARE					
PRE-ADOPTIVE					
OTHER (SPECIFY)					

(2b.) Please indicate here the source of data used to complete this item.

(2c.) Is this data source available for further use in the foster family care research project?
( ) No
( ) Yes, from _____.

(2d.) If you have no data on this item, please indicate where data might be obtained.

(3.) As of July 1, 1975, what was the actual number of children in your agency's foster family home program at that time? _____.

(3a.) If special licenses/approvals are granted, please indicate below the actual number of children in each category on the above mentioned date.

TYPES OF HOMES	TOTAL HOMES USED: LICENSED/ APPROVED	TOTAL HOMES USED: UN-LICENSED	TOTALS BY CHILDREN'S RACE: BLACK	WHITE	OTHER	TOTALS BY AGE GROUPS: UNDER 1 Yr.	1-5	6-12	13-18
REGULAR FOSTER FAMILY HOMES									
A. LONG TERM									
B. SHORT TERM									
EMERGENCY SHELTER CARE									
PRE-ADOPTIVE									
OTHER (SPECIFY)									

(3b.) Please indicate here the source of data used to complete this item.

(3c.) Is this data source available for further use in the foster family care research project?
( ) No
( ) Yes, from _____.

(3d.) If you have no data on this item, please indicate where data might be obtained.

(4.) During fiscal year 74-75, what was the total number of children served through placement in your agency's foster family home program? _____.

(4a.) If special licenses/approvals are granted, please indicate the total number of children served through placement in each of the categories listed below.

TYPES OF HOMES	TOTAL	CHILDREN's RACE			AGE GROUPS			
		BLACK	WHITE	OTHER	INFANTS	1-5	6-12	13-18
REGULAR FOSTER FAMILY HOMES								
A. LONG TERM								
B. SHORT TERM								
EMERGENCY SHELTER CARE								
PRE-ADOPTIVE								
OTHER (SPECIFY)								

(4b.) Please indicate here the source of data used to complete this item.

(4c.) Is this data source available for further use in the foster family care research project?
( ) No
( ) Yes, from _____.

(4d.) If you have no data on this item, please indicate where data might be obtained.

THE LICENSING PROCESS

(5.) If your agency issues special licenses/approvals for foster family homes specializing in the fostering of the exceptional child, please provide the total number of such homes available as of July 1, 1975 _____ and their aggregate capacity _____. If none, check here ( ) and proceed to question # 7.

(5a.) If special licenses/approvals are granted, please indicate the total number of homes available at the above date in each category and their aggregate capacity.

SPECIALIZATION	TOTAL HOMES USED: LICENSED/ APPROVED	TOTAL HOMES USED: UN-LICENSED	AGGREGATE CAPACITY: LICENSED/ APPROVED	AGGREGATE CAPACITY: UN-LICENSED	SINGLE PARENT: TOTAL	SINGLE PARENT: AGGREGATE CAPACITY	CHILDREN'S RACE: WHITE TOTAL	CHILDREN'S RACE: WHITE AGGREGATE CAPACITY	CHILDREN'S RACE: OTHER TOTAL	CHILDREN'S RACE: OTHER AGGREGATE CAPACITY
MENTALLY RETARDED										
PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED										
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED										
PRE-DELINQUENT										
OTHER										

(5b.) Please indicate here the source of data used to complete this item.

(5c.) Is this data source available for further use in the foster family care research project?
( ) No
( ) Yes, from _____

145

(5d.) If you have no data on this item, please indicate where data might be obtained.

144

(6.) If your agency issues special licenses/approvals for foster family homes specializing in the care of the exceptional child, please provide the total number being served in such homes as of July 1, 1975 _____. If none, check here ( ) and proceed to question #7.

(6a.) If special licenses/approvals are granted, please indicate the total number of children in placement in such homes July 1, 1975 in each category below.

	CHILDREN's RACE			AGE GROUPS			
SPECIALIZATION	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER	UNDER 1 YR.	1-5	6-12	13-18
MENTALLY RETARDED							
PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED							
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED							
PRE-DELINQUENT							
OTHER							

(6b.) Please indicate here the source of data used to complete this item.

(6c.) Is this data source available for further use in the foster family care research project?
( ) No
( ) Yes, from _____

(6d.) If you have no data on this item, please indicate where data might be obtained.

7. Please list other divisions or agencies within your county which, to your knowledge, have foster family home programs. Please list any known agency heads or addresses. Indicate if your agency can or cannot use this resource.

7a. State divisions or bureaus:	Contact Person	Address	Can you use?
			( ) can
A1			( ) cannot
			( ) can
A2			( ) cannot
			( ) can
A3			( ) cannot

7b. County, Regional, or Metropolitan agencies	Contact Person	Address	Can you use?
			( ) can
B1			( ) cannot
			( ) can
B2			( ) cannot
			( ) can
B3			( ) cannot

7c. Private agencies:	Can you use?
	( ) can
C1	( ) cannot
C2	
C3	

8. Listed below are some reasons why your agency might not be able to use the foster family care programs of other agencies. Beside each of the reasons which affects your use of other agency resources place the letter of the agency from question 7a, 7b, and/or 7c to which the reason applies.

Reason our agency cannot use resources of other agencies	Agency letter (a), (b), (c), etc.) from question 8 to which the reason applies
a. Our agency does not handle the type child served by the resource.	_____
b. The resource agency does not serve the type child handled by our agency.	_____
c. The resource agency's foster family homes are fully utilized by the agency itself (there are no vacancies).	_____
d. Resource is not in compliance with Civil Rights Statutes.	_____
e. Costs of resource is prohibition for our agency's use.	_____
f. Our agency policies prohibit use of the program Specify: _____ _____ _____ _____	
g. The policies of the resource agency prevent the use of the program by our agency. Specify: _____ _____ _____	
h. Other (specify) _____ _____ _____	

(9.) Among the foster family homes licensed by your agency, what would you estimate is the average time span from point of apolication to licensing or approval?

Type of Foster Family Home	Estimate of Application-Approval Time Span in Weeks	We do not license this type home
Regular Foster Care	_____	( )
Long Term Care	_____	( )
Short Term Care	_____	( )
Emergency Shelter Care	_____	( )
Pre-Adoptive Care	_____	( )
Special Care	_____	( )
Mental Retardation	_____	( )
Emotional Disturbed	_____	( )
Physically Handicapped	_____	( )
Other _____	_____	( )

(9a.) Please list any data sources which are available on the time required for the application/licensing process.

( ) None available _____

( ) Yes, available from _____

_____

(9b.) In your opinion what are the most significant causes for delay in the licensing/approval process?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

(9c.) Please rate each of the following factors according to how they facilitate or delay the application/licensing/approval process. Check the appropriate box for each factor.

Factor	Usually Does Not Delay the Licensing Process	Sometimes Delays the Licensing Process	Often Delays the licensing Process
1. Availability of Home-Study Staff	( )	( )	( )
2. Fire Reports	( )	( )	( )
3. Home Study Report	( )	( )	( )
4. Financial Reports	( )	( )	( )
5. Administrative Procedures	( )	( )	( )
6. General Bureaucratic Policies	( )	( )	( )
7. Physical Expenses for Foster Family	( )	( )	( )
8. Health Dept. Home Evaluation	( )	( )	( )

(10.) Is financial assistance available from any of the following sources to assist potential homes to meet approval/licensing standards?

Source	Financial Assistance Available Yes	No
State Agency	( )	( )
County Agency	( )	( )
Municipal Agency	( )	( )
Private Agency	( )	( )
Professional Association (Foster Parent Assoc., etc.)	( )	( )
Other _____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

(10a) Please explain any "yes" answer. _____

_____

_____

ANNUAL TURNOVER

(11.) Please supply the following figures on the annual turnover of foster family homes licensed/approved by your agency. The figures should be reported for fiscal year 1974-75 if they are available, or for the most recent year available otherwise.

Figures are for year _____.

Type of Foster Family Home	Number of homes Licensed at the beginning of the year	Number of new homes approved	Number of licenses revoked and voluntary withdrawals	Number of licensed homes at end of year
Regular Foster Care				
Long Term				
Short Term				
Emergency Shelter Care				
Pre-Adoptive				
Specialized (M.R., handicapped, etc.)				
Single Parent Homes (if Granted Special License/approval)				
Other				
TOTAL				

153

154

Please list the data source for these figures _____

_____

(12.) Please supply the following figures on the number of applications of foster parent homes which were processed during fiscal year 1974-75 if they are available, or for the most recent year available otherwise.

Figures are for year _____.

Type of Foster Family Home	Total # of Applications Received	# of Applications denied	# of voluntary withdrawals	# of applications approved
Regular Foster Care Long Term Short Term				
Emergency Shelter				
Pre-Adoptive				
Specialized Care (M.R., Handicapped, Etc.)				
Single Parent (If granted Separate license/ approval				
Other				
Total				

Please list the data source for these figures. _____

_____

(13.) Below is a list of reasons that cause potential or experienced foster parents to be rejected or withdraw from the application process or the foster family program itself. Please estimate how frequently each cause was a reason for rejections, withdrawals and revocations during your 1974-75 fiscal year. Rate as follows:

very frequent	frequent	average	infrequent	very infrequent
1	2	3	4	5

( ) Check here if no data is available on these matters.

	FOSTER FAMILY APPLICANTS		LICENSED HOMES	
Causes for Rejection Revoking or withdrawal:	Reasons for Rejection	Reasons for withdrawal	Reasons for Revoking	Reasons for withdrawal
a. Economic condition of the foster family				
b. Amount of board and fee rate paid foster parents				
c. Bad experiences with foster children				
d. Lack of adequate housing				
e. Health hazards in the Home				
f. Safety hazards in the home				
g. undesirable moral character				
h. Dissolution of the family unit				
i. Age of the foster parents				
j. Relocation of foster parents				
k. Death of foster parent (s)				
l. Bureaucratic delay				
m. Unwilling to accept available children				
n. Other: _____				
o. Other: _____				

FINANCING

(14.) Does your county provide a special board rate for exceptional children?
( ) No
( ) Yes, $_____per day month year (circle one)

If yes, what are the requirements for eligibility for the special rate and what does it pay for? _____

_____

_____

_____

(14a.) Does your county pay a service fee to foster parents in addition to the board rate?
( ) No
( ) Yes, $_____ per day month year (circle one)

If yes, under what circumstances is the service fee paid and what does it pay for? _____

_____

_____

_____.

(14b.) Does your county provide any financial assistance in addition to the regular board rate?
( ) No
( ) Yes

If yes, list the types of assistance and amounts.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

What does each rate pay for?

(14c.) Please check the appropriate column on the right to indicate from which sources of funds the expenses listed on the left are paid.

	Basic Board Rate	Special Board Rate	Service Fee Source____	Medicaid	Foster Parent's Own Resources	Other ____ ____	Other ____ ____
1. Room and Board							
2. Clothing							
3. Transportation							
4. Medical							
5. Emergency Medical							
6. Dental							
7. Special Medication							
8. Prosthetic Devices							
9. Orthodontal Problems							
10. School Expenses							
11. Initial Placement Expenses							
12. Allowances (Cash Spending money for child)							
13. Medical Insurance							
14. Liability Insurance							
15. Other							

158

15

14d. What are the common sources of appropriations for these rates, i.e. basic board, special board, and service fees? Please check the appropriate space.

	Basic Board	Special Board	Service Fee
a. County government	( )	( )	( )
b. City government	( )	( )	( )
c. State appropriations	( )	( )	( )
d. Federal monies	( )	( )	( )
e. Private charities	( )	( )	( )
f. Other (specify) _____	( )	( )	( )
g. Combination of the above (specify with appropriate litter of alphabet)	( )	( )	( )

14e. Are any other public or private funds allowed to supplement the service payments made to foster parents?

( ) No, supplemental sources are not allowed.
( ) Yes, supplemental sources are allowed, but none are available.
( ) Yes, supplemental sources are allowed and are used as regular payments to foster parents.
( ) Yes, supplemental sources are allowed and are used in special or emergency situations. Please explain: _____

_____

_____

14f. Please check each of the kinds of resources and income which are taken into account when your agency calculates the amount of the payment to be made to a foster parent for each foster child.

NATURAL PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN ASSETS	CHECK IF TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT
Parents's earned income	( )
Parents' total cash income	( )
Parents' savings accounts	( )
Parents' checking accounts	( )
Value of Parents' real estate and personal property	( )
Parents' business assets	( )
Total assets of parents	( )
Other parent assets (specify)	( )
_____	
_____	

NATURAL PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN LIABILITIES	
Rent or mortage payments	( )
Household expenses	( )
Dental & Medical expenses	( )
Personal property expenses	( )
Number of dependents in the foster family household	( )

CHECK, IF TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

Number of foster children in foster family household	( )
Total number of members of foster family household	( )
Cost of insurance payments	( )
Other (specify)	( )

When is the natural parent or legal guardian required to take an active part in the financial support of the child in foster care?

At all times regardless of parent's attitude toward shared cost	( )
Only when parents are aggreable to shared cost	( )
Other (explain) _____	
_____	( )

FOSTER CHILD ASSETS

Foster child's earned income	( )
Foster child's total cash income	( )
Foster child's total cash assets including bank accounts	( )
Value of foster child's real estate and personal property	( )
Total assets of foster child	( )
Any Liabilities of foster child	( )

Please List _____

_____

_____

LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY

(15.) Please check the appropriate column(s) on the right below to indicate who generally has legal responsibility (liability) for each of the liable situations listed on the left. In instances of possible multiple liability, please check all possibilities, to the best of your knowledge:

LIABLE SITUATION	STATE	COUNTY AGENCY	FOSTER PARENT	NATURAL PARENT OR LEGAL GUAR.	CHILD	OTHER
a. Foster Child is abused or neglected by foster parent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Foster child is abused by someone outside the foster home	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Foster child destroys property in foster home	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Foster child assaults foster parents	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
e. Foster child destroys property in the community	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
f. Foster child assaults a member of the community	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g. The foster home is found to be physically unsafe	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h. The foster home is found to be morally undesirable	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
i. It is discovered that the foster home was physically unsafe or morally undesirable at the time it was licensed anyway, and the foster child suffers some harm as a result of the foster home conditions	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

j. A hospital care bill is incurred for medical treatment of the foster child	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
k. The foster child is injured while riding in the foster parents' automobile	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
l. The foster child is reported truant	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
m. The foster child's turancy results in failure to pass his grade, and he is found to lack adequate supervision in the foster home	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
n. Burial of foster child	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
o. Foster child is injured while riding in natural parent's automobile	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
p. Foster child destroys community property while on a home visit with natural parents	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

(15a.) If under any of the above situations you have indicated the child as being liable, please explain what variables and/or conditions would warrant his/her liability, e.g., age of child, employment status, legal status, etc.

_____

_____

_____

(16.) Please check below any benefits foster family parents have as extended staff members of your agency.

a. no staff benefits ( )
b. medical services ( )
c. Hospitalization insurance ( )
d. Major medical insurance ( )
e. Personal liability insurance ( )
f. Legal services ( )
g. Retirement fund ( )

h. Credit Union Membership ( )
i. Property replacement coverage ( )
j. Other (specify) _____

_____

_____

16a. If liability insurance is made available to foster parents, who pays for the insurance? _____

RECRUITMENT

17. Check in the appropriate columns on the right below to indicate at what level your agency conducted any of the recruitment efforts on the left during fiscal year 1974-1975.

( ) No Recruitment Efforts

RECRUITMENT EFFORT	LEVEL CONDUCTED FY '74-75 County-Wide	City-Wide	Community Groups
a. Newspaper advertisements	( )	( )	( )
b. Newspaper features or interviews	( )	( )	( )
c. Television features or interviews	( )	( )	( )
d. Television advertisements	( )	( )	( )
e. Public and lay speaking engagements	( )	( )	( )
f. Speaking engagements at professional gatherings	( )	( )	( )
g. Preparation and distribution of brochures and pamphlets	( )	( )	( )
h. Radio advertisements	( )	( )	( )
i. Radio features or interviews	( )	( )	( )
j. Community canvas	( )	( )	( )
k. Use of professional advertising or marketing consultants	( )	( )	( )

RECRUITMENT EFFORT	County-Wide	City-Wide	Community Groups
l. Use of foster parents	( )	( )	( )
m. Use of foster parent associations	( )	( )	( )
n. Use of volunteers	( )	( )	( )
o. Use of other professional as associations or organizations	( )	( )	( )
p. Use of public agencies (Please specify)	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )
q. Use of private agencies (Please specify)			
_____	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )
r. Other _____	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )

17a. Have any of the above recruitment efforts been expended to increase the supply of foster homes for children who have not been easily placed for the following reasons? If yes, please check all appropriate spaces.

a. Ethnicity ( )
b. Special problems, e.g., emotional behavioral ( )
c. special problems, e.g., physical handicaps ( )
d. special problems, e.g., mental deficiencies ( )
e. age factor
   - very young children and infants ( )
   - young school age children ( )
   - adolescent males ( )
   - adolescent females ( )

If NO efforts of this sort have been made, check here ( )

TRAINING

18. Please read the items and statements on the left below. For any of the items or statements which are apart of or apply to your agency's foster parent training program, please check one or more of the columns on the right to indicate at what level the item or statement applies.

TYPE OF TRAINING	County Level	City Level
a. Group type orientation training is given to new or potential foster parents by agency staff at the	( )	( )
b. Experineced foster parents are used in the training of new foster parents	( )	( )
c. Our foster parents receive their training from other agencies at the	( )	( )
d. The cost of training of foster parents is paid at the	( )	( )
e. Specialized trianing in the care of exceptional foster children is provided at the	( )	( )
f. Cost of specialized training is paid by the	( )	( )
g. A manual for foster parents is produced at the	( )	( )
h. Foster care newsletters are produced at the	( )	( )

18a. If initial orientation <u>is not provided</u> to foster parents, go to question 18c. If initial orientation is to foster parents, how is such orientation carried out?

	County Program	City Program
Individually only	( )	( )
In groups only	( )	( )
Combination of both	( )	( )
Orientation is:		
Formally structured	( )	( )
Informally structured	( )	( )
Combination of both	( )	( )

Continue by answering 18b, only if orientation is provided at the county level. If not, go to 18c. Your county orientation focuses on: (Check all that apply).

(18b.) Educating foster parent in the mechanics of the foster care program (focus, chain or command, foster parent care) ( )
Assisting foster parents in their ability to counsel with children ( )
Aspects of child development, e.g., What to expect for specific age groups ( )
Budgeting and home management ( )
Understanding educational needs of children ( )
Understanding emotional needs of children ( )
Effective disciplinary measures ( )
Other (explain) _____ ( )

_____

(18c.) Is in-service, i.e., ongoing training provided to foster parents? Check the appropriate space:

Yes ( )
No ( )

If in-service training is not provided, please go to question 19.

If in-service training is provided at the county level, please complete the following for the appropriate level(s):

c1. In-service training for foster parents is a well planned program in your county.

Yes ( )
No ( )

c2. In-service training is carried out:
Individually only ( )
In groups only ( )
A combination ( )
Comments _____

_____

c3. In-service training is:
Formally structured only ( )
Informally structured only ( )
A combination ( )
Comments _____

_____

c4. In-service training is offered:

On a regularly scheduled basis ( )
Irregularly ( )
Comments _____

_____

18d. If in-service training is provided at the county level, please indicate the major focus of these efforts. Check all that apply.

Assisting foster parents in their ability to counsel with children ( )
Aspects of child development, e.g., What to expect for specific age groups ( )
Budgeting and home management ( )
Understanding educational needs of children ( )
Understanding emotional needs of children ( )
Effective disciplinary measures ( )
Effective uses of Foster Parent Organizations ( )
Reviews of State Policies and Procedures ( )

19. In what kinds of self-enriching activities might foster parents in your county participate? Please check all appropriate sp

( ) None
( ) Agency staff meetings
Professional meetings, conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.
( ) County
( ) State
( ) National meetings held within your state
( ) National meetings held outside your state
( ) Opportunities for participation in short-term educational courses, programs, etc.

19a. If foster parents may attend state and/or national conferences how are expenses paid? Please check appropriate space(s).

a. Foster parent incurs cost ( )
b. Individual agency funds ( )
c. County funds ( )
d. City funds ( )
e. State funds ( )
f. Other (specify) _____ ( )
g. Combination of the above (specify by using appropriate letters of alphabet) _____ ( )

(20.) Are foster parents asked to serve on any of the following committees? Please specify committee and function.

( ) None
( ) Advisory committees _____

_____

( ) County boards _____

_____

( ) Action committees _____

_____

( ) Other committees _____

_____

(21.) Is there a National Action for Foster Children Committee active in your county?

( ) No
( ) Yes

(21a.) If yes, list any projects of the National Action for Foster Children Committee which of your knowledge are

( ) Completed _____
( ) Currently underway _____
( ) Planned _____

(22.) Does your county have a Foster Parents Association?

( ) Yes
( ) No

(22a.) Are county liaison workers appointed to work with county associations?

( ) Yes
( ) No

RESEARCH

(23.) Have any special studies, program reviews or program audits been made recently on foster care in your county?

( ) No
( ) Yes (please specify when and by whom) _____

_____

_____

Where my copies be obtained _____

_____

CASE REVIEW

(24.) Under your system of case management, how often are cases of children in foster care reviewed? _____

(24a.) Is there any additional review system, such as judicial review, review committee, etc.

( ) No
( ) Yes, (please specify the procedure) _____

_____

_____

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

(25.) Please check any of the following data which are routinely gathered on children in foster family care.

( ) a. Child's birthdate
( ) b. Child's sex
( ) c. Child's race
( ) d. Child's education level
( ) e. Number of brothers and sisters
( ) f. Source of referral to your agency
( ) g. Number of previous placements
( ) h. Previous living arrangement
( ) i. Who has legal custody of child
( ) j. Age of natural mother
( ) k. Age of natural father
( ) l. Race of natural mother
( ) m. Race of natural father
( ) n. Natural mother's education level
( ) o. Natural father's education level
( ) p. Occupation of natural mother
( ) q. Occupation of natural father
( ) r. Marital status of natural parents
( ) s. Child's income level and sources
( ) t. Natural parents' income level
( ) u. Ages of child's brothers and sisters
( ) v. Employment status of natural mother
( ) w. Employment status of natural father
( ) x. Date of placement
( ) y. Reason for current placement
( ) za. Child's handicaps, if any
( ) zb. Reason for removal
( ) zc. Date of Last Case Review
( ) zd. Other _____

25a. In question 25 above, please circle the letter of any of the data items which are reported to a computer file where they are aggregated.

26. Please check any of the following data which are routinely gathered on foster parents, and circle those reproted to a computer file:

( ) a. Age
( ) b. Sex
( ) c. Race
( ) d. Marital Status
( ) e. Education level
( ) f. Occupation
( ) g. Employment Status
( ) h. Income
( ) i. Strengths or Weakness with special children
( ) j. Workshops attended or special training
( ) k. Current license/approval status
( ) l. # of natural children
( ) m. Total member of household including foster children
( ) n. Ages of the above
( ) o. Sex of the above
( ) p. Race of the above
( ) q. Dates of Other placements
( ) r. Dispositions of other placements
( ) s. Other _____

_____

_____

REFERRAL SOURCES

24. Please complete the following table to indicate the numbers of children placed during fiscal year 74-75 (or the most recent year for which figures are available) who were referred to your agency from each of the sources listed on the left. If no numbers are available, please estimate the percentage for each category.

Sources of Referral	Total # of Referrals		Sex of Children				Race of Children						Age of Child							
			F		M		Black		White		Other		Infant		1-5		6-12		13-18	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Welfare Dept.																				
Mental Health																				
Mental Retardation																				
Youth Services																				
Public Health																				
Juvenile Court																				
Family Court																				
Criminal Court																				
Police Dept.																				

Sources of Referral	Total # of Referrals		Sex of Children				Race of Children						Age of Child							
			F		M		Black		White		Other		Infant		1-5		6-12		13-18	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Sheriff's Dept.																				
Church Organization																				
Social Security Admin.																				
Other State Agency																				
Other County Agency																				
Other city Agency																				
Private Individuals																				
Doctors																				
Charity Organizations																				
Parents (both)																				
Mother only																				
Father only																				
Child																				
Other _____																				

27a. For each of the referral sources listed below please indicate any recent trends which have developed in the number of referrals.

Sources of Referral	RECENT TREND IN REFERRALS				
	Sharp increase	Moderate increase	No change	Moderate decrease	Sharp decrease
Welfare Dept.					
Mental Health					
Mental Retardation					
Youth Services					
Public Health					
Juvenile Court					
Family Court					
Criminal Court					
Police Dept.					
Sheriff's Dept.					
Church Organization					
Social Security Admin.					
Other State Agency					
Other County Agency					
Other City Agency					
Private Individuals					
Doctors					
Hospitals					
Charity Organization					
Parents (both)					
Mother only					
Father only					
Child					
Other _____					

(28.) Please complete the table below to indicate the number of foster children in your agency's caseload who receive financial support from the sources listed on the left. If no numbers are available, please estimate the percentage of the total caseload.

Source of Financial Support	Number of Children Receiving some money from this source		Number of children Receiving Total support from this source	
	No.No.	%	No.	%
Foster parents				
Welfare Dept.				
AFDC-FC				
CW-FC				
Mental health dept.				
Mental retardation dept.				
Youth services				
Public health dept.				
Courts				
Social Security admin.				
Other county agency _____				
_____				
Private Organizations _____				
_____				
Natural parents				
Other relatives				
Inheritance				

(29.) Please list below the number and percent of your agency's placements which occurred for the fiscal year 74-75 in the locations indicated, relative to the child's home county.

Location of placements of children	Number	Percent
a. In their own home county	_____	_____
b. Out of their own home county but within state	_____	_____
c. Out of their home state	_____	_____

(30.) For the Out-of-county placements listed in question 34b, please indicate what percent are placed out-of-county-in-state for the reasons listed on the left below.

Reasons for Out-of-County Placements	Percent
a. No available in-county foster home	_____
b. Child with exceptional needs, no specialized in-county home available	_____
c. To remove child closer to specialized facilities	_____
d. To move child from proximity to natural parents	_____
e. No foster parents of the same ethnic group as child available in-county	_____
f. Other _____	_____
g. _____	_____

(30a.) For the out-of-state placements listed in question 34c, please indicate what percent are placed for the reasons listed on the left below.

Reasons for out-of-County Placements	Percent
a. No available in-county foster home	_____
b. Child with exceptional needs, no specialized in-county home available	_____
c. To remove child from proximity to natural parents	_____
d. To move child closer to specialized facilities	_____
e. No foster parents of the same ethnic group as child available in-county	_____
f. Other _____	_____
g. _____	_____

30b. Do you have children in out-of-state placements who are in such settings because the foster parents with whom they were initially placed moved their residence?

( ) Yes
( ) No

Does State Policy Prevent This?

( ) Yes
( ) No

Can you estimate the approximate number of such placements for fiscal year 1974-75?

( ) Yes. If yes, please indicate exact number_____ approximate number _____.
( ) No

30c. Do you have children in out-of-county placements who are in such settings because the foster parents with whom they were initially placed moved their residence?

( ) Yes
( ) No

Does State Policy Prevent This?

( ) Yes
( ) No

Can you estimate the approximate number of such placements for fiscal year 1974-75?

( ) Yes, If yes, please indicate exact number _____ approximate number _____.
( ) No

30d. What percent of out-of-county placements do you estimate could have been in-county placements if an in-county foster home had been available? _____

31. To your knowledge have the efforts of organized foster parent groups effected the supply of and demand for foster care in your state?

( ) No
( ) Yes, (please explain) _____

_____

UNMET NEEDS

32. How many children in the general caseload do you estimate are in need of foster family care, but are not getting it? _____

What percentage of all children in the general caseload does this figure represent? _____percent

32a. How many children would you estimate are presently in the living arrangements listed below who could more properly be placed in foster family homes if foster family homes were available?

Present Living Arrangements:		Number of Children who should be in Foster Family Care		Uncertain
		Number	Percent	
a.	Detention home	_____	_____	( )
b.	Mental health facility	_____	_____	( )
c.	Mental retardation facility	_____	_____	( )
d.	Children's home (residential institution)	_____	_____	( )
e.	Own home	_____	_____	( )
f.	Relative's home or other informal substitute care	_____	_____	( )
g.	Other	_____	_____	( )
		_____	_____	( )

33. How many children would you estimate are presently in foster family care who need one of the other kinds of care listed below?

Kind of Care Needed:		Number	Percent	Uncertain
a.	Detention home	_____	_____	( )
b.	Mental health facility	_____	_____	( )
c.	Mental Retardation facility	_____	_____	( )
d.	Children's home (residential institution)	_____	_____	( )
d.	Own home	_____	_____	( )
e.	Relative's home or other informal substitute care	_____	_____	( )
f.	Other	_____	_____	( )
		_____	_____	( )

CASE DISPOSITION

(34.) In your best estimate, how many children during fiscal year 74-75 were referred to foster care but were not placed because of one of the following reasons:

Reason for Child Not being Placed:	Number of Children Referred but Not Placed
1. Lack of foster family homes	
2. Lack of specialized foster family homes	
3. Lack of special supportive services	
4. Lack of legal custody of the child	
5. Lack of home study staff	
6. Other	

Do you have data available on this question? ( ) No
( ) Yes _____

_____

(35.) What is the percent of all your foster children now in foster family care who have had prior placements in:

a. Previous foster family homes _____%

b. Other foster care arrangements _____%

c. Institutions _____%%

d. Other types of substitute care _____%

(36.) What is the average length of total time your foster care children stay in some kind of substitute living arrangement?_____

(37.) What is the average total length of time children remain in each of the kinds of substitute care listed below:

Kind of Substitute Care:	Average length of Total time in care (in months):
Foster family care	
Other foster care	
Institutions	
Other_____	

38. What is the average number of placements that your foster family children have in some type of substitute care? _____

38a. What is the average number of placements after their first placement in foster family care? _____

39. Do you have any data sources for questions 43 through 46?

	Yes	No	If Yes, Specify
Question 43			
Question 44			
Question 45			
Question 46			

40. During fiscal year 1974-76 what percent of the children in your foster family care program were:

1. Returned to home of natural parents _____%
2. Returned to home of extended family _____%
3. Placed in institutions/group homes _____%
4. Released when reached age of majority _____%
5. Adopted by foster parents _____%
6. Adopted by persons other than foster parents _____%
7. Reverted to a permanent foster care status _____%
8. Other _____ _____%

_____ _____%

41. Does your foster family care program have a permanent foster care status for children?

( ) No
( ) Yes - How many children are in this status? _____.

When was permanent foster care made available? _____.

(41a.) During the fiscal years identified below, how many termination of parental rights petitions have been initiated by your agency on children in foster family care and denied by the court or granted by the court?

1974-75	initiated	_____
	denied	_____
	granted	_____
1973-74	initiated	_____
	denied	_____
	granted	_____
1972-73	initiated	_____
	denied	_____
	granted	_____

(41b.) How many children currently in foster family care qualify for and could benefit from termination of parental rights?

number of children _____

% of number in care _____

(41c.) Is legal assistance or funds for the purchase of legal assistance available to your agency for termination of parental rights?

_____ Yes, adequate legal assistance available

_____ Yes, but inadequate

_____ No

CUSTODY

(42.) Of the total children you have in foster family care, what percent would you estimate are in each of the following categories of custody status.

Who has Custody of Child	% of All Foster Children
1. Natural Parents	_____
2. Your Agency	_____
3. Court	_____
4. Other Relative	_____
5. Other Agency	_____
6. Foster Parents	_____
7. Other	_____

Do you have data available of this question?

( ) No
( ) Yes, from _____

_____

TERMINATION OF PARENTAL RIGHTS

(43.) During fiscal year 1974-75 how many termination of parental rights petitions were initiated? _____

(43a.) How many termination petitions were completed? _____

(43b.) Are the laws governing termination of parental rights adequate in your state?

( ) Yes
( ) No (please specify what you feel to be the inadequacies)

_____

_____

_____

(43c.) Does your county make adequate use of the termination of parental rights laws?

( ) Yes
( ) No (Please explain) _____

_____

(43d) Do the courts make adequate use of the termination laws?

( ) Yes
( ) No (please explain) _____

_____

_____

(43e) Does your system of case review in foster family care give adequate attention to the need for termination of parental rights?

( ) Yes
( ) No (please explain)_____

_____

_____

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE QUALITY OF FOSTER FAMILY CARE

(44.) Answer the following questions by rating each item from 1 to 5 according to its influence. Please rate each item listed.

(44a.) How much influence do you feel the following items have on the improvement of the quality of the foster homes available. Circle the numbers.

Item	Rating					
	Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Uncertain
1. Current Licensing/approval Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	U
2. Current Licensing/approval Standards	1	2	3	4	5	U
3. Specialization of License/approvals (Emergency Shelter care, M.R., Teenagers, Infants, pre-adoptions, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
4. Accessibility of supplemental reports (Fire inspections, health inspections, medicals, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
5. Financial Assistance to meet licensing/approval requirements	1	2	3	4	5	U
6. Adequate Board Rate	1	2	3	4	5	U
7. Additional Reimbursements:						
A. initial clothing reimbursement	1	2	3	4	5	U
B. regular clothing reimbursement	1	2	3	4	5	U
C. special board rate	1	2	3	4	5	U
D. children's allowances and entertainment	1	2	3	4	5	U
E. service fee	1	2	3	4	5	U
F. other: specify	1	2	3	4	5	U
G.	1	2	3	4	5	U
8. Training in Conduction Home Evaluations	1	2	3	4	5	U
9. Specialized Training in Foster Care Placement for Case Managers	1	2	3	4	5	U

183

18

	Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Uncertain
10. Specialized Training in Foster Care Maintenance for case managers	1	2	3	4	5	U
11. Specialized Training in working with natural parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
12. Other training for case managers	1	2	3	4	5	U
13. Foster Care Training for foster parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
14. Training in specialized foster care for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
15. Permanent Foster Care	1	2	3	4	5	U
16. Foster Parent's as Team Members (Increased role in case planning, therapy, responsibility, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
17. Foster Parent's input in policy making (serve on county boards, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
18. Liability Insurance for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
19. Staff Benefits for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
20. Foster Parent Participation in Recruitment and Training	1	2	3	4	5	U
21. Public Recognition of Foster Parent Role (mass media, declarations, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
22. Comprehensive Foster Parents Manual	1	2	3	4	5	U
23. Use of volunteers in Foster Care Program	1	2	3	4	5	U
24. Foster Parent Associations	1	2	3	4	5	U
25. National Action for Foster Children Committees	1	2	3	4	5	U
26. Participation in National Regional State Conference	1	2	3	4	5	U
27. Foster Care Review Committees or Judicial Review	1	2	3	4	5	U

	Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Uncertain
28. Adequate Termination of Parental Rights Laws	1	2	3	4	5	U
29. Computorized method of data gathering, storage, and recall regarding foster care	1	2	3	4	5	U
30. Coordination with other service agencies and institutions	1	2	3	4	5	U
31. Foster Parent Adoptions	1	2	3	4	5	U
32. Other: specify	1	2	3	4	5	U
33.	1	2	3	4	5	U

(44b.) How much influence do you feel the following items have on the supply or quantity of foster homes available. Circle the numbers

Item	Rating: Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Uncertain
1. Current Licensing/approval Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	U
2. Current Licensing/approval Standards	1	2	3	4	5	U
3. Specialization of License/approvals (Emergency Shelter care, M.R., Teenagers, Infants, pre-adoptions, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
4. Accessibility of supplemental reports (Fire inspections, health inspections, medicals, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
5. Financial Assistance to meet licensing/approval requirements	1	2	3	4	5	U
6. Adequate Board Rate	1	2	3	4	5	U

	Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Uncertainence
7. Additional Reimbursements:						
A. initial clothing reimbursement	1	2	3	4	5	U
B. regular clothing reimbursement	1	2	3	4	5	U
C. Special board rate	1	2	3	4	5	U
D. Children's allowances and entertainment	1	2	3	4	5	U
E. Service Fee	1	2	3	4	5	U
F. Other: Specify	1	2	3	4	5	U
G.	1	2	3	4	5	U
8. Training in Conduction Home Evaluations	1	2	3	4	5	U
9. Specialized Training in Foster Care Placement for Case Managers	1	2	3	4	5	U
10. Specialized Training in Foster Care Maintenance for Case Managers	1	2	3	4	5	U
11. Specialized training in working with natural parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
12. Other training for case managers	1	2	3	4	5	U
13. Foster Care Training for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
14. Training in specialized foster care for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
15. Permanent Foster Care	1	2	3	4	5	U
16. Foster Parent's as Team Members (Increased role in case planning, therapy, responsibility, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
17. Foster Parent's input in policy making (serve on county boards, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
18. Liability Insurance for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
19. Staff Benefits for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
20. Foster Parent Participation in Recruitment and Training	1	2	3	4	5	U

	Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Uncertain
21. Public recognition of Foster Parent Role (Mass media, declarations, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
22. Comprehensive Foster Parents manual	1	2	3	4	5	U
23. Use of volunteers in Foster Care Program	1	2	3	4	5	U
24. Foster Parent Associations	1	2	3	4	5	U
25. National Action for Foster Children Committees	1	2	3	4	5	U
26. Participation in National Regional State Conference	1	2	3	4	5	U
27. Foster Care Review Committees or Judicial Review	1	2	3	4	5	U
28. Adequate Termination of Parental Rights Laws	1	2	3	4	5	U
29. Computorized method of data gathering, storage,and recall regarding foster care	1	2	3	4	5	U
30. Coordination with other service agencies and institutions	1	2	3	4	5	U
31. Foster parent adoptions	1	2	3	4	5	U
32. Other: specify	1	2	3	4	5	U
33.	1	2	3	4	5	U

191

(44c.) How much influence do you feel the following items have on your agency's ability to meet the changing demands in foster family care? Circle the numbers.

192

Item	Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Uncertain
1. Current Licensing/approval Procedures	1	2	3	4	5	U

	Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Un Certain
2. Current Licensing/approval Standards	1	2	3	4	5	U
3. Specialization of License/approvals (Emergency Shelter care, M.R., teenagers, Infants, pre-adoptions, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
4. Accessibility of supplemental reports (Fire inspections, health inspections, medicals, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
5. Financial Assistance to meet licensing/approval requirements	1	2	3	4	5	U
6. Adequate Board Rate	1	2	3	4	5	U
7. Additional Reimbursements:						
A. initial clothing reimbursement	1	2	3	4	5	U
B. regular clothing reimbursement	1	2	3	4	5	U
C. Special board rate	1	2	3	4	5	U
D. Children's allowances and entertainment	1	2	3	4	5	U
E. Service Fee	1	2	3	4	5	U
F. Other: specify	1	2	3	4	5	U
G.	1	2	3	4	5	U
8. Training in Conducting Home Evaluations	1	2	3	4	5	U
9. Specialized Training in foster care Placement for Case Managers	1	2	3	4	5	U
10. Specialized Training in Foster Care Maintenance for Case Managers	1	2	3	4	5	U
11. Specialized Training in working with natural parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
12. Other training for case managers	1	2	3	4	5	U
13. Foster Care Training for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
14. Training in specialized foster care for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
15. Permanent Foster Care	1	2	3	4	5	U

	Lesser Influence		Average Influence		Greater Influence	Uncertain
16. Foster Parent's as Team Members (Increased role in case planning, therapy, responsibility, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	U
17. Foster Parent's input in policy making (serve on county boards, review committees, ad hoc committees, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
18. Liability Insurance for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
19. Staff Benefits for Foster Parents	1	2	3	4	5	U
20. Foster Parent Participation in Recruitment and Training	1	2	3	4	5	U
21. Public Recognition of Foster Parent Role (mass media, declarations, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	U
22. Comprehensive Fsoter Parents Manual	1	2	3	4	5	U
23. Use of volunteers in Foster Care Program	1	2	3	4	5	U
24. Foster Parent Associations	1	2	3	4	5	U
25. National Action for Foster Children Committees	1	2	3	4	5	U
26. Participation in National Regional State Conference	1	2	3	4	5	U
27. Foster Care Review Committees or Judicial Review	1	2	3	4	5	U
28. Adequate Termination of Parental Rights Laws	1	2	3	4	5	U
29. Computorized method of data gathering, storage, and recall regarding foster care	1	2	3	4	5	U
30. Coordination with other service agencies and institutions	1	2	3	4	5	U
31. Foster Parent Adoptions	1	2	3	4	5	U
32. Other: specify	1	2	3	4	5	U
33.	1	2	3	4	5	U

45. In the chart below, please indicate which source of funding pays for the services offered by foster parents. In other words, what does each fund pay for?

Foster Parent Services	Source of Funding: Regular Board Rate	Special Board Rate	Clothing Fees	Service Fee	Other	Other	Not Reimbursed
I. General Tasks							
A. Provide Room to Board							
B. Initial Clothing Outlay							
C. Regular Clothing Replacement							
D. Other: Specify							
II. Medical							
A. Routine Medicine Chest Items							
B. Routine Physicals for Foster Children							
C. Medicine and Treatment not covered by medicaid							
D. Special Diets							
E. Transportation for medical appointments							
F. Meet with doctor, therapist, etc., active role in therapy							
G. Contacts, visits, letters, etc. with hospitalized or institutionalized foster child							
H. Record, observe, etc., exceptional child& share with treatment team							
I. Medicals to meet relicensing/reapproval standards							
J. Other: Specify							
III. School							
A. Transport foster children to school							
B. Meet with teachers regarding new foster children							
C. Attend P.T.A. meetings & teachers conferences							
D. Special activities fees & equipment							
E. Special tutoring of foster child							
F. Graduation expenses							
G. Expenses involved in special education							
H. Other: specify							
IV. Religious Training							
A. Transportation to child's church or denomination							
B. Involving the child in foster parent's church activities							
C. Other: specify							

	Source of Funding						
	Regular Board Rate	Special Board Rate	Clothing Fees	Service Fee	Other	Other	Not reimbursed
V. Legal Involvements							
A. Liability Insurance							
B. Adoption expenses to adopt a foster child							
C. Replacement of damaged property not covered in liability/ insurance							
D. Other							
VI. Entertainment							
A. Allowances							
B. Membership fees & other expenses - social groups (girl scouts, YMCA, etc.)							
C. Summer camps							
D. Vacation plans including foster child							
E. Entertainment expenses (movies, ball games, etc.)							
F. Other							
VII. Foster Care Program							
A. Serve on County Boards Advisory Boards, etc.							
B. Foster Parent Associations (membership, transportation, etc.)							
C. Recruitment of foster parents (speakers bureau, T.V., etc.)							
D. Promotion of Foster Care							
E. Attend workshops, conferences, etc.							
F. Training of New Foster Parents - attending or heading							
G. Assist in standard setting, budget planning, newsletter, etc.							
H. Serve on appeal boards							
I. Other							
VIII. Additional							
A. Work with natural parent							
B. Worth with child to effect return home or movement							
C. Other:							
D.							
E.							

199A

199B

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS DIFFICULT BUT VERY IMPORTANT QUESTIONNAIRE ON COUNTY FOSTER FAMILY CARE PROGRAMS IN THE SOUTHEAST!

APPENDIX B

SOUTHEASTERN FOSTER PARENTS SURVEY

Conducted
by:

The Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research
and
Your State and Local Foster Care Agency

Funding provided by:

The Social & Rehabilitation Service, DHEW
SRS Grant # 09-P-56015/4-07

Complete and Return to:

RISWR
Box 152
Athens, Ga. 30601

I.D.# _____ _____ _____

SOUTHEASTERN FOSTER PARENTS SURVEY

Conducted By:
The Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research
and
Your County and State Foster Care Agency

I. You and Your Own Family

INSTRUCTIONS: To begin, we would like to know something about you and your family. Please fill in the blanks and check the boxes in this section for all questions.

			Foster Mother	Foster Father
1)	Age in Years (write in):		☐	☐
2)	Race (check one):	White	☐	☐
		Black	☐	☐
		Other	☐	☐
3)	Formal Education: Highest Level Completed: (Check one)	Grade School	☐	☐
		High School	☐	☐
		Trade School	☐	☐
		College	☐	☐
		Graduate School	☐	☐

4)	Your Total Family Income For 1975. DO NOT INCLUDE Foster Care Board Payments. (check one)	Under 4,000	☐
		4,000-7,999	☐
		8,000-11,999	☐
		12,000-15,000	☐
		Over 16,000	☐

5) Do you have a local Foster Parent Association? (check one)

Yes ☐
No ☐
Don't Know ☐

6) If yes, are you a member? (check one)

Yes ☐
No ☐

7) Are you a member of the National Foster Parents Association? (check one)

Yes ☐
No ☐

Go to Page 2

8)

INSTRUCTIONS: Now could you tell us a little about your own children, adopted as well as natural by filling out the following chart. If you have no children of your own, write "none" on the chart and go to question 9.

Your own children

	(check one)		(write in)			
	Natural	Adopted	Male	Female	Age in Years	Is Child Living With You Now? Yes / No
Your 1st child						
2nd child						
3rd child						
4th child						
5th child						
6th child						
7th child						
8th child						

II. Foster Children You Have Cared for in the Past 2 Years Who Have Left Your Home

9)

INSTRUCTIONS: We would like some information on the foster children you have had in your home since January 1, 1974, who have left your home. Do not include information on foster children in your home now, only on those who were with you over the last 2 years who have left. If you had no such children, write "none" in the chart below and skip to question 13.

Foster Children in Your Home Since January 1, 1974, Who Have Since Left

	Total Number of Children by Age	Give Number of Each Sex for Each Age Level		Give Number of Each Race for Each Age Level		
		Males	Females	White	Black	Other
Under 1 yr.						
1 - 5 yrs.						
6 - 12 yrs.						
Over 13 yrs.						

10) Please give the number of these children by roughly how long they stayed with you before leaving:

Number of Children	
	Stayed less than 1 month
	Stayed between 1 to 6 months
	Stayed between 6 months and 1 year
	Stayed over 1 year

Go to Page 3

11) Continuing on foster children who have left your care in the last 2 years, please show the number of these children for whom you had guardianship or legal custody awarded by the court:

Number of children for whom you had legal guardianship ☐

Number of children for whom you had temporary legal custody ☐

Number of children for whom you had neither custody nor guardianship ☐

Number of children for whom you were not informed of their legal status ☐

12) Finally, to the best of your knowledge, please tell us where these foster children went after they left your Home:

Number of Children

☐ Returned to their natural parents

☐ Returned to Homes of relatives

☐ Sent to another foster home

☐ Sent to a children's institution

☐ Placed for adoption

☐ Ran Away

☐ Don't know where they went

III. Foster Children in Your Home Now

13) Please record the number of foster children in your home now in this box ☐

14)

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS: We have included a number of blue sheets in your questionnaire. Please read and complete a separate blue sheet for each foster child now in your Home.

Please make sure to complete both sides of each blue sheet and to include them with your completed questionnaire when mailing it to us.

Go to Page 4

IV. Recurring Foster Care Services That Cost Money

15)

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a long list of services that cost money to provide. These services may cost you or someone else more than you get in your board rate for your child's daily care.

Do 1: Examine the list. Then check first how often you provide each service. Leave blank if you never provide a particular service.

Do 2: Then, go back through the list and check who pays for the service. Add any service at the bottom you provide that is not included.

Foster Child Services and Needs	1 I provide this service. (Check one)				2 If you provide this service, who pays most or all of the cost? (Check one)			
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Yearly	I Pay	Agency Pays	Natural Parent	Other
A) Transportation: (to school, doctors, agency, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B) Special diets for medical reasons	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C) On-going clothing needs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D) Special clothing needs (scout uniforms, graduation gowns, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E) Personal grooming needs (barber, cosmetics, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
F) Recreation needs (movies, cruises, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
G) Recreation equipment (footballs, skates, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
H) Artistic activities (dance, art, music classes and materials)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I) Toys, games, and child's birthday gifts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
J) Allowances	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
K) School expenses (books, supplies, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
L) School Lunch	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
M) Fees and dues (scouts, school clubs, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Go to Page 5

		I provide: (check one)				Who pays: (check one)			
		Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Yearly	I Pay	Agency Pays	Natural Parent	Other
N)	Child's legal expenses (lawyer, bail bond, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
O)	Summer camp or vacation costs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
P)	Foster parent liability insurance to cover damage to persons or property caused by foster child	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Q)	Foster parent needs to meet agency health and safety regulations (your health exams, fire extinguishers, home repairs, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
R)	Foster parent needs for relief foster parents and baby sitters	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
S)	Foster parents attendance at training sessions, workshops, and conferences	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	ADD OTHER SERVICES/COSTS NOT LISTED								
T)	_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
U)	_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
V)	_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

16) Now that you have reviewed many questions about the services you provide your foster children, would you please tell us, in your best judgment, how much of the total cost of caring for your foster child (or children) is covered by the board rate and special allowances, if any, that you receive from your agency?

The board rate and special allowances (if any) cover: (check one)

- ☐ Less than 25% of the total costs of foster care
- ☐ Over 25%, but less than 50%
- ☐ About half, or 50%
- ☐ Over 50%, but less than 75%
- ☐ Over 75 %, but not the total cost
- ☐ 100% or all costs

Go to Page 6

V. Your Willingness to Care for "Hard to Place" Children

17) To begin this section, please tell us how many years your home has been licensed or approved to provide foster family care. Give the number of months if less than 1 year:

Number of years ☐ or Number of months ☐

18) Now, please indicate what type of license or approval you presently have with your agency (check one):

- ☐ regular foster family care
- ☐ specialized foster family care
- ☐ group foster family care
- ☐ emergency foster family care or shelter home
- ☐ other (write in): _____
- ☐ I don't know what type license/approval I have.

19)

INSTRUCTIONS: From time to time agencies consider certain types of children "Hard to place." Agencies are now turning to foster parents to care for these children.

Please tell us which of the types of children listed below you have already agreed to accept, those you would consider accepting if more money and services were provided, or those you will not accept.

(check one column for each type of child):

		I have already agreed to accept:	I would consider accepting, if more money and/or services were provided:	I will not accept this type child:
a)	Mentally Retarded children	☐	☐	☐
b)	Physically handicapped children	☐	☐	☐
c)	Delinquent Children	☐	☐	☐
d)	Emotionally disturbed children	☐	☐	☐
e)	Children waiting to be adopted	☐	☐	☐
f)	Children needing emergency/short term placements (less than 30 days)	☐	☐	☐
g)	Brother/sister (sibling) groups	☐	☐	☐
h)	Teenagers	☐	☐	☐
i)	Infants	☐	☐	☐
	ADD OTHER HARD TO PLACE TYPES, NOT LISTED			
j)	_____	☐	☐	☐
k)	_____	☐	☐	☐

VII. Training You Need to Understand and Care for "Hard to Place" Children

20)

INSTRUCTIONS: Look back to your answers in column 2, question 19. If all the types of "Hard to Place" children you would consider accepting are not shown below, please write them in in the empty boxes. Cross out types of children already listed that you would not accept.

Now, please check each and every topic that you would like to have training about to improve your ability to care for each type of child you would consider accepting into your home.

Are the types of children you will not accept crossed out, and others you will or would consider accepting written in?

If so, check ALL topics you need training in to help you care for each type of child.

Training Topics	Delinquents	Mentally Retarded	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	(write in)	(write in)
a) Normal child development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Methods of discipline/supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Child nutrition & health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Personal grooming	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Emotional problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Sexual behavior & dating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Foster parent & child relationship with natural parents	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Foster child relationships with your own children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i) Foster parents legal rights/ responsibilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j) Board rate & other budget problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k) Foster parent relationship with agency	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l) Custody/guardianship proceedings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m) Other agency & community services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n) State laws & agency policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ADD OTHER TOPICS YOU WOULD LIKE TRAINING IN						
o) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Go to Page 8

VIII. Additional or Better Services You Need to Understand and Care for Hard to Place Children

21) **INSTRUCTIONS:** Write in and/or cross off types of "Hard to Place" children as you did in question 20.

Then, please check the kinds of agency/community services you would need to have to accept and care for each type of child.

I would need more or better services of the types checked below in order to consider accepting each type of child I have listed:

Needed Agency/ Community Services	Delinquents	Mentally Retarded	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Distrubed	(write in)	(write in)
a) Medical Services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Dental Services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Psychiatric Services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Psychological Testing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Casework Counseling	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Physical Therapy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Relief foster parents & baby sitting services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Legal Services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i) Recreational facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j) Special education & tutoring services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k) Foster parent association services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
ADD OTHER NEEDED SERVICES NOT LISTED						
l) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

END OF QUESTIONNAIRE!

Thank you for your patience and goodwill in contributing to the success of this important study!

Please remember to include a completed blue sheet for each foster child now in your home when you mail this questionnaire to us.

As a final request, please indicate who completed this questionnaire (check one).

☐ Foster mother

☐ Foster father

☐ Both foster parents

APPENDIX C

FOSTER CHILD INFORMATION SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete a separate sheet for each foster child now in your home.

Complete both sides of this sheet.

Child's Age, Sex, Race, School Grade (Check one box for each question)

1. **Age in Years:**

Under 1 Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Over 18 Years
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	

2. **Sex:** Boy ☐ Girl ☐

3. **Race:** White ☐ Black ☐ Mixed ☐ Other ☐

4. **Grade in School:**

Pre-School	1	2	3	4	5	6	Special Classes	Dropped Out	Vocational School
	7	8	9	10	11	12			

Placement Information

5. Indicate month and year child was placed with you: Mo ☐ Yr ☐

6. Were you given information on the following when this child was placed: (Check yes or no for each item)

	Yes	No	Yes, But Not Enough
Birth verification	☐	☐	☐
Social/ethnic background	☐	☐	☐
Natural parents background	☐	☐	☐
Medical History	☐	☐	☐
Eating/Sleeping habits	☐	☐	☐
Special behavior problems	☐	☐	☐

7. A. Were you told how long this child would be in your home? Yes ☐ No ☐

   B. Has this length of time been exceeded? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Have you had regularly scheduled meetings with the placing agency's worker to discuss future planning for this child? Yes ☐ No ☐

Complete otherside

9)

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of behaviors that are serious problems for many foster parents in caring for foster children.

Check the yes box next to each behavior that is or has been a problem for you in caring for this child. Then, check the one box to the right that best tells how you are handling or handled each problem.

Check the yes box only if you are having or have had a problem with this foster child about:

For each yes answer, check the box under column 1, 2 or 3 that best tells how you are handling or handled each problem.

		1 I decided to handle this problem myself	2 I received agency (or other) help	3 I asked for but I am not getting help
a) Poor eating habits?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
b) Poor table manners?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
c) Poor personal cleanliness?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
d) Sloppy dress?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
e) Wets bed or messing pants?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
f) Night mares/bad dreams?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
g) Constant crying?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
h) Nail biting?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
i) Too quiet or shy?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
j) Day dreaming?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
k) Temper tantrums?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
l) Lies often?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
m) Sassy to adults?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
n) Using drugs?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
o) Using alcohol?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
p) Smoking tobacco?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
q) Masturbation	Yes	☐	☐	☐
r) Dating habits?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
s) Fighting with other kids?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
t) Running away from home?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
u) Failing at school?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
v) Shop lifting?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
w) Stealing household goods?	Yes	☐	☐	☐
x) Breaking household goods?	Yes	☐	☐	☐

ADD ANY PROBLEM NOT LISTED:

y) _____	Yes	☐	☐	☐
z) _____	Yes	☐	☐	☐